

A
RATIONAL ACCOUNT
Of the Doctrine of
ROMAN-CATHOLICKS
Concerning the
ECCLESIASTICAL
GUIDE
In CONTROVERSIES
OF RELIGION.

Reflecting on the later Writings of Protestants; particularly, of Archbishop *Law*, and Dr. *Stillingfleet*, on this Subject.

By R. Holden (they say) — *1000*
Doctor

The Second Edition, with Additions.

- 1 Pet. 3. 15. — *Parati semper ad satisfactionem omnipotentis vos rationem.*
2 Cor. 6. 8. — *Per Infamiam & bonam Famam; ut Seduciores, & Veraces.*

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXIII.

RATIONAL ACCOUNT
 OF THE DOCTRINE OF
 ROMAN-CATHOLICS
 Concerning the
 NECESSITY OF
 GUIDED
 CONFESSIONS
 OF RELIGION.



Edited by the Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.,
 and Dr. G. H. Lewes, F.R.S.
 of the subject.

By R. Holden (1844)

The Second Edition, with Additions.

Printed by T. Agnew & Sons, 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.
 and by J. H. Lewes, 1, Bedford Square, London, W. 1.

Printed in the Year MDCCXLIV

THE
P R E F A C E
TO THE
R E A D E R.



After the sad effects of discord, and quarrels in Religion so long experienced, an End of such Controversies cannot but be by all pious Christians most passionately desired: And an end of them, if it may be, by an *Infallible*, or unerring decision, of those necessary. That a Writing also, if clear and free from any ambiguity in its sense, may decide these is confessed by all; (For, if words written cannot, neither can words spoken; since nothing can be said, but what may be written): and granted also, that such Writing doth decide them infallibly, if it be the *Holy Scripture*. But it appears, that the sense of *Holy Scriptures* is not, in all Controversies that are thought necessary to be determined, so clear, but that it is called in question, and disputed, by considerable Parties. For the ending of which, therefore, that God hath left another living Guide (his Church, or the Ecclesiastical Governors thereof), which is, in all Ages, in the exposition of *Holy Scripture*, and the decision of these Controversies, as to *Necessaries*, *Infallible*; from other *Secrets* easily discerned; in its sentence easily Understood, is, in these Discourses, pretended to be proved: And learned Protestants also shewed, to maintain those Principles, from which it seems rationally consequent.

Any such living, *Infallible*, Guide Protestants strongly deny, and oppose. And, hereby, if indeed there be such a Guide, it incurs great peril, as to their Salvation, By denying a due obedience, and Submission of Judgment to its Authority and Decisions; And, by deserting its Communion, as not to be enjoyed, or

other

The Preface.

other terms. And 2ly. become *unsettled*, and of a *various* judgment, in several points of Religion of great concernment; and daily subdividing into more *Sects*.

Their many objections, therefore, and difficulties, urged against the being of any such Guide, are here considered, and replied to: Especially those occurring in the writings of their later Divines, Arch Bp. *Law*, Bp. *Bramhall*, Dr. *Hammond*, Dr. *Ferne*, Mr. *Chillingworth*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and others. Whose Art and diligence hath been so great in fighting against their own Happiness (if I may so say), and in hindring Themselves and others, with all imaginable arguments, from returning into the Unity of the Catholick Church, and Faith, that there seems nothing left out, or neglected by them, that can hereafter be said, new, in their Defence. Of which objections, whether any of moment, and pertinent to the matter in hand, are, here, concealed, or of those mentioned any not fully satisfied, is left to the equal Reader's Judgment.

The Author, though conscious of his weakness, yet confident of the Cause, and, presuming, so necessary a Truth to have so much advantage over Error, as that it needeth not the very sharpest wit, and exactest Judgment, to vindicate and maintain it, hath taken in hand this task, (in the long silence of many other more able Workmen), that he might give satisfaction to some persons, who seem, with great indifference, to desire it; and that the Adversary, in having the *last Word*, might not also, to some weaker judgments, seem to have the *best Cause*. And, to this end, He hath also wholly applied himself, therein, to the *language* and *expressions* of *Protestants*, used in this Controverſie; and endeavored to follow their Motion to the *indefinite Particulars*, and last Retreats, and hath built a good part of his discourse on their own Concessions (as more prevalent with such Readers); and those materials, which their own writings afford, advantageous to Truth, and the present design.

Recommending this most important affair to the Protestant Reader's most serious consideration. As which, if what is promised here be made good, will possess Him of a much more true, and solid Satisfaction, and Tranquillity of mind, than his former Principles could possibly afford Him: * Whilst now he discerns himself, (contrary to what he, before, imagined), guarded, in his way to heaven, with a *double Guide* unfaillable: *The Holy Scriptures*, in what points they are clear: And next, the *Holy Church*, in what they seem *obscure*; into whose judgment, and sentence, he safely resolves all his former Scriptures and anxieties concerning

such

The Preface.

such Texts, wherein a mistake is any way dangerous. *Whilst now, by a new, and holier way, of mortifying his own judgment instead of confuting another's, and especially, that of *Superiors*; and, of subduing his *passions* † instead of enriching his *intellect*; and seeking the possession of Truth by *humility*, and *obedience*, instead of *Science*, and *Argument*, he becomes fixed, and settled in most of those Controversies (as already stated by this Guide) which still entangle, and perplex others; The *light* of his own *Reason* first serving him so far, as to the discovery of that *Guide*; (a discovery, wherein, the divine providence having left it so clear and evident, a sincere, and unbiassed quest cannot miscarry), to whom once found out, he is, afterward, for all other things, (I mean, that are prescribed by this Guide), to subject and resigne, it.

*Whilst now, he renders himself one of those *Babes*, to whom God, by these *Spiritual Fathers*, in all simplicity believed by him, reveals what things are hid from the *self-wise*, and prudent; who are still standing upon their Guard, with *Pythagoras* his *μύησις ἀριστή*, & the Jew's *Quomodo*, (Jo. 6. 52.), in their mouths; missing of Truth, (where *Authority*, and *Tradition*, teach it). out of too much wariness to be deceived.

*Whilst now, as *Mary* at our *Lord's*, so he meekly sits at his *Church's* feet, and heareth her words; when as those others, whom he hath left, full of learned cares from their youth, (like *Sr. Austin*, when a *Manichee*), how, and where to finde *Truth*, taught to believe no side; to search, and rife all; are staring, all their life long, every Controversie anew to themselves; one on this manner, another on that; examining all, pretended, *Foundations*, whether solidly laid, (For, where, say they, may not an *Humane Testimony* deceive them?) even from the more principal: The essential *Unity* of the *Trinity*; The *Divinity*, and *Eternity* of *Christ*, and of the *Holy Ghost*; the *Ubiquity* of *Gods Essence*, and his *Absolute Prescience*; the number, and right use of the *Sacraments*; The *Commission* of the *Church's Hierarchy*, and *Bishops*; their just authority, and from whom they hold it; (for, in all these, they finde acute *Divines* calling on their impartiall, and unresigned, judgment for a review); to those lower points (yet these also of no small debate among persons straid once from this *Guide*) of the lawfullness of bowing at the *Communion Table*; of being uncovered in *Churches*; of making the signe of the *Cross* in *Baptism*; of Baptizing one yet an *Infant*; of wearing a *Surplice*, &c. Things (high, or low) that trouble none, who hath once undergone the mortification of dethroning his own judgment, and hath captivated it to the unity of the *Church's Faith*.

† St. August.
De Serm. Dom.
in Aboute, l. 1.
c. 3. on Beati
pauperes spiritu-
m. Oportet,
animam se-
mitem prebe-
re pietate, ne id,
quod imperius
videtur absur-
dum, videretur
audere; &
per vicariis
concentrationi-
bus officium
inducit.

* Whilst

† Ep. 48.

2 Tim. 2. 19.

1 Tim. 3. 15.

Apocal. 2. 1.

Whilst now also, after such an humble obedience, and conformity first yielded, he passeth further, and comes to understand the *doctrines* of this *Guide* to be much other, than they were formerly represented unto him; and to be assented-to, on good reason, as well as submitted-to, on just *Authority*; saying with those new *Converts* in St. *Austin* †—*Nos falsis rumoribus terrebamur intrare; quos falsos esse nesciremus, nisi intravimus—Gratias Deo, qui expertos docuit, quam vana, & inania de Ecclesiâ suâ mendax fama pallaverit*: For the Church's *Doctrines* are seldome, by her adversaries, delivered favourably; and either the *Sense* of her *Divines* not given with their words; or those Writers quoted, who affect extremes, and do afford more advantage to the Gain-sayer; and the most of men, whilst aliens from the Church, and obliged, by their secular interest, to dislike, and oppose her Tenents, do take no great care to inform themselves, what these are, save only from those, who disguise and misrelate them.

But now, thus undeceived, in the last place he receives yet more contentment to see, that *Church*, spread over all *Nations*, and once the *Spouse* of *Christ*, not, since, to be (as he formerly fancied) for many Generations, miserably apostatized from her primitive faith, and purity, and stained with a manifold *Idolatry*, (whilst the Great *Antichrist* sitteth in her chief *Chair*, and giveth her lawes); poisoning the Nations with her gross errors, and daily making more of them to drink of the wine of her *Abominations*, and herself also drunk with the blood of the *Saints* (for such things his *Teachers* once made him believe); But, this Church to be a *Foundation* abiding sure, and the *Pillar* of *Truth*, for ever; Our Lord walking still amongst her *Candlesticks*, and holding her *Stars* in his hand; and by them from age to age enlightening the dark places of the world; *Internal*, and *External* Sanctity, *Corporal*, and *Spiritual* mortifications, accompanying one another, and growing together to an Angel-like purity in her *Saints*, and those, who order their actions according to her most excellent *Doctrines*, and *Counsels* of *Perfection*. In the lives of which *Persons* (found in all latter ages a most exact pattern of the former) he now examines the *Holiness* of this *Church*, and not in those others (whose crimes in every age are by the Church's Adversaries curiously sought out, and divulged, to shew, that most scandalous persons have professed the Roman Faith, (as, who was ever so wicked, is one of our Lord's *Disciples*?) Whom he now discerns to have departed no further from *Goodness*, than they also did from her *Rules* and *Lessons*; and well perceives, that a continued Purity of the Church's *Doctrines* is, more rationally, collected from the *Sanctity* of the one, than

than a Corruption therein, from the viciousness of the other; because it may rather be presumed, that the wicked should transgress the Church's laws, than the virtuous transcend them; and because, both of *Persons*, and *Ages*, some may be observed to have been much more impious, than others (as perhaps the 9th, or 10th age, than the 11th, or 12th); where, yet, the Church's *Doctrines* or *Laws* are confessed to have suffered no mutation; and therefore, such wickedness not to have proceeded from their influence; and where those holy men of the same times, who are produced to reprehend the faulty, yet are known to have continued still with them in the same *Communion*, and *Faith*.

* Whilst now, he also discerns an uniform descent of the Church's faith, and a true concatenation between the doctrines of the former *Fathers*, and latter *Schoolmen*. and the *sentences* of the one constituting the *Theology* of the other; these latter ascending indeed (by pursuing the necessary consequents of former Principles), into the highest subtleties of this divine Science, but without pretending a *Reformation* of any thing formerly delivered, or imposing their *new* discoveries on any ones *Faith*. And therefore no more now, doth he look into them, only as a *Spy* into the Camp of the Enemy, to discover the specious fallacies of these great Wits against truth, and to give intelligence to his own party to beware of their Sophisms; Or, at best, turns over their Volumes only to pick here, and there, a flower, as it were out of a Garden overrun with weeds: But, now, reads them, as a dutiful *Son* or docible *Schollar* doth the lessons of his *Master*, or prescriptions of his *Ancestors*, to transcribe, and follow their Institutions, and rules, and propagate to posterity what he learns from them. Neither, on another hand, takes he now any more disgust and scandal at her *Moral Divines*, and *Casuits*; considering them according to their proper employment; not as persons conversing with *Saints*, and drawing up Rules of *perfection*; but applying themselves to the Confessions of *Sinners*, and with as equal a balance, as Theology affords them, weighing the culpableness of such actions, as are brought before them, in order to exciting a due and proportionable Penitence and Contrition. Where he easily sees, that it were an equal injustice in them, to aggravate, as to lessen, faults: and, to put mens Souls into false scruples, and terrors, as to leave them in false securities. Hence are they most what busied in setting forth the utmost bounds, which an action, ~~not, to be perfect~~, or praiseworthy, but *lawful* or *sinless*, is capable of: or also not this: but only, what bounds it must not pass to be not sinning *mortally*: or not *mortally* in such a particular *species* thereof: though perhaps in

old a some

some other it is so. * Which *Casuits* he now discerns to be greatly wronged, when some sentences of theirs, commonly stript also of some of the necessary circumstances, are produced, as recommending, or encouraging an action, that is only by them declared, no sin; or as countenancing or excusing a sin, that is only declared by them no such crime, as excludes from Grace, and the state of Regeneration; or as calling Evil, good; when as that Circumstance is concealed by the Accuser, upon which supposed only, and not absolutely, they pronounce such action Good, or lawful.

Again, * Whilst now, being thus established in a right understanding of the *Church*, and of her Doctors, He proceeds to look upon those Heterodox persons, who from time to time have gone out of this *Church*, not as departing out of *Babylon*, but out of the *City of God*; and that have all, till *Luther's* last defection, after a short blaze, come to nothing. And again, looks on those *Nations*, who from time to time (even from the furthest East and West) have entered into this *Church*, not as, thus, reduced only from one *Idolatry* to another (which he formerly imagined) from the *Heathen* Idolatry, to the *Roman*; but, from *Gentilism* to that *Faith*, to which our Lord foretold, and promised, a *Conversion* of all *Nations*, before the last times; and that, not the Kingdome of *Antichrist*, but of *Heaven*, hath been truly preached unto them; the same Kingdome to other Heathen People by her indefatigable Missioners now, which was, heretofore, to our Ancestors by *St. Austin*, that holy Monk. All these illuminations and consolations will he receive, and all these Diving Providences will he rejoyce in, and praise God for, in this *Church*, if it shall once be discovered to him to be his true Guide; and if that which is asserted in these Discourses, shall (by the Grace and Benediction of God) appear to him Truth.

In the proof and evidencing of which, the Author likewise hath reason to expect from him the more favourable audience, because those, who most vehemently dispute against any such infallible Director, yet cease not to wish, that there were such a one; as a thing acknowledged most highly beneficial to Christianity; and they maintain the Controversie, not without a professing, that they would most willingly be confuted in it,—If there be such an infallible Judge of Controversies (saith Mr. Chillingworth†) it would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church; and perhaps as much as all the rest of the Bible, if in some Book of Scripture, which was to be undoubtedly received, this one proposition had been set down in terms, &c. [Now, if it be not necessary, that there should be such an infallible

Mat. 24. 14

† c. 2. §. 136.

ble Judge,; what great necessity, certainly to know him, in case there were one? yet, this a thing, he saith, *infinitely beneficial to the Church, and perhaps as much, as all the rest of the Bible.*] And, elsewhere, — *If I knew* (saith he) *any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church.* Behold this, by *Protestants* so earnestly wished for, *Roman-Catholicks* shew unto them, with proofs sufficient to satisfy the rational, but not force the obstinate: It faring no better with this *Church*, than with its *Lord*: Of whom many of the *Pharisees*, and self-wise, though desiring nothing so much as the happiness, once to see their *Messias*, or live in his daies, yet, (even whilst they conversed familiarly with him, and received all Salutory doctrine from him, confirmed with Miracles) being blinded with many other prejudices, and mistaken fancies concerning Him, and also wanting that humility of the Common people, to Learn this Truth, amongst others, from Him, that He was their *Messias*, could never persuade themselves, that He was indeed such a Person, and so perished in their unbelief.

But, Blessed be our *Lord*, who mean-while both, then, clearly manifested Himself to those, who were *Babes*, i.e. humble, and not *wise in themselves*: And since, upon his necessary departure, *Mat. 11. 25* hath not left his Children here, *Orphans*, and destitute, either of *Rom. 12. 16* *Spiritual Fathers*, of whom he hath said; that *He that heareth them, Luk. 10. 16. heareth Him*: [therefore these not misguiding in necessities] : or of a *Spiritual Mother*, of whom he hath said: that *He that Heareth Her not, shall be esteemed as an Heathen*: Nor yet left his *Little ones* destitute of sufficient Evidences, and marks, by which, for ever to discern true *Parents*, and *Guides*, from other *Pretenders*, and *Impostors*; so that they *know their Voice*; and *do not follow the voice of strangers*. *Jo. 10. 4, 5.* Which *Evidences* the Author presents to the serious Enquirer in these following Discourses, and so commits him to the powerful *Teacher of hearts*, and the illuminations of his *Holy Spirit*.

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIRST DISCOURSE:

CHAP. I.

That the Promise of Infallibility belongs to the Guides of the Church-Catholick,

The Church-Catholick granted by all, in some sense, unerrable in Fundamentals, for ever, §. 1.

1. Some Protestant Divines granting the Church-Catholick unerrable in Fundamentals, or Necessaries; but, not as a Guide, §. 3.

Reply. That the Divine Promises of Infallibility, or not erring in Necessaries, belong to the Church-Catholick, as a Guide; or, to the Guides of the Church-Catholick, §. 5.

CHAP. II.

That the Promise of Infallibility, made to the Apostles and their Successors, is not Conditional, but Absolute.

Several Limitations of Protestants, concerning these Promises.

1. That they were made only to the Apostles, §. 8.

2. Or made to all the succeeding Church-Guides, but conditional, §. 12.

Reply. That our Lord's Promise of Inficiency in Necessaries was not made to the Apostles only, but to their Successors, §. 9. And to their Successors, not conditional, but absolute, §. 14.

CHAP. III.

That not some Inferiour or smaller part of the Clergy, but the Superiour and Major Part, is that Guide to whom the Promises belong.

H. Other Protestant Divines granting the Clergy (some or other of them) always unerring in Necessaries; but this not necessary in the Superiours, or major part of them, §. 15.

Reply.

The Contents.

Reply. That th. subordinate Clergy can be no Guide to Christians, when opposing the Superior; nor a few, opposing a much major, part, §. 20.

CHAPTER IV.

That Councils (wherein are some Dissenters) if accepted by a much Major part of the Church diffusive, do conclude the whole and oblige Obedience.

III. Other Expressions of Protestant Divines, granting the Church's Prelacy as defining her Doctrine, or the General Councils of them, to be unerrable in Necessaries, when accepted by the Church Universal, §. 22.

Where, concerning what Judgment of the Church sufficiently obligeth her Subjects, in respect, 1st, of the Church-Catholick diffusive §. 28. 2^{ly}, of Councils General §. 30. 3^{ly}, of Councils Occidental §. 35. and particularly, that of Trent §. 39.

And, concerning what acceptance of Councils by the Church diffusive is only necessary, §. 38.

CHAPTER V.

That the Church-Governor before the Reformation erred not in Necessaries.

IV. Learned Protestants conceding, the former Church's Clergy preceding the Reformation never were in defining Necessaries, as that the Church governed by them did not remain still True, Holy, and Catholick, §. 40.

CHAPTER VI.

The Chief Modern Controversies decided by former obliging Councils.

That, according to the former Concessions, made in the former Chapter, §. 22. &c. (if so enlarged, as ancient Church-practice, and Reason requires,) all or most of the Protestant Controversies are by former (obliging) Councils already decided, §. 46. n. 1-6.

An Instance hereof in the Controversy of the Corporal Presence in the Eucharist, or Transubstantiation, §. 57.

CHAPTER.

The Contents.

CHAR. VII.

The Security in continuing in the Ancient Communion.

That according to the former Concession made in the 3th Chapter, § 41. there seems to be a great Security to those continuing in the Ancient Communion, §. 71.

As to avoiding Heresy, or Schism, §. 72.

As to other grosser Errors, §. 77.

And danger to those deserting it, §. 80.

The Protestant's Defence for such Discession, §. 80. n. 2.

The Catholic's Remonstrance, §. 81.

THE

C O N T E N T S

OF THE

SECOND DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

*Concerning these Guides, some Concessions of
Learned Protestants.*

Protestants assenting.

1. *That there is, at this present, an One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick, Church, §. 1.*

2. *That the present Pastors and Governours thereof have Authority to decide Controversies, §. 2.*

3. *And that these Governours shall never err or mis-guide Christians, at least in absolute Necessaries, §. 3.*

4. *And that they, with the Church governed by them, do stand always distinct from Heretical, and Schismatical, Congregations, §. 5.*

CHAP. II.

Further Assertions of Roman-Catholicks.

Catholicks, further affirming,

5. *That, if these Pastors be infallible in Necessaries, the people are to turn from them, what is necessary, §. 6.*

6. *That.*

The Contents.

6. That this their Infallibility in *Necessaries* must extend not only to some few points absolutely necessary, but all other very beneficial, to Salvation, §. 9.
7. That it is no way requisite, That these Church-Guides should exactly distinguish all such *Necessaries* from other points not so, §. 12. Which they may infallibly guide us, though they do not infallibly separate, §. 14. And, when no distinction of these is made, ought to be believed in all they propose, §. 15. Yet that they do both distinguish, and propose as such, all those more necessary points which it is requisite for all Christians more particularly, and explicitly to believe, §. 17.
8. That Christians, if submitting to their Judgment in deciding *Necessaries*, ought also to submit to the same, in their declaring the sense of Fathers, Definitions of Councils, &c. touching the same matters, §. 19.
9. That, supposing these Guides to err in some of their Decisions, yet (even by the Concession of Learned Protestants) their Subjects ought to yield Obedience, either of Silence, or also of Assent, to them in all such points, whereof they cannot demonstratively prove the contrary, §. 20.
10. Whence it follows; That, none may adhere to any new Guides, save only those persons, who can demonstrate the Errours of the former, §. 21.

CHAP. III.

The Rule whereby to discern our Ecclesiastical Guide.

11. That these Church-Governours may teach diversly, and some of them err in *Necessaries*, and fall into *Heresies*, §. 22.
12. And therefore Christians are permitted to follow, whom of them they please: But some certain Rule there is, to which of them, in any Division, they ought to adhere. That this Rule, according to the universal Church-practice, is, and rationally can be, no other, than, in these Judges subordinate dissenting, to adhere to the Superior; in those of the same Order, and Dignity, dissenting, to the Major part, §. 23. &c.
Where, Of the Major part concluding the whole, in the ancient Councils, §. 25. n. 2.
And, Of the Defection of the Church-Prelacy in the times of *Arrianism*, §. 26. n. 2.
13. That the Protestant-Marks, whereby to discern true from false Guides, as to the Quest here (viz. to learn from these true Guides, which,

CHAPTER IV.
Application of the former Rules.

CHAP. IV

An Application of the Form of Proposals for a Church, which is to
be presented to the Church or Ecclesiastical Assembly, is
our own Guide, p. 36.

*Several Manuscript readings, from the Roman, and other Western Churches, which will fit, and the Florentine of S. Peter's success-
ful, are fit,*

1st, Their being the very same Body with rise, which Remnants
-100- was 150 years ago this Guide, 1931.

24. Their being that Body, to which Christians ought to submit, is the Rule delivered, 1st Cor. 12: 20 observed, 1: 35

32y: These being that Body shewing, and witnessing, the De-
termined and Divided of all those former Councils, which the Church
of preceding Ages did receive as General, or ordinary, as well
those times, as those before, the first, or seventh, Council, &c. 32y:

CHAP. V.

Scriptures make any other Infallible Guide.

There is not much difference between the two, and the difference is not much.

The Private Secrecy of the Secretaries, who may, or may not, perform their duties, is to be maintained in all circumstances.

That all necessary commands, Scriptural, proven in the unwritten, clear
in Scripture: and the Controversies in non-Necessaries neede's so
be decided, §.38.

That all Necessaries are clear in Scripture: Because God hath left no other certain means or Guides for the knowledge of them, §.39.n.1.

*Hath left no other Guide,
Which Guide is Infallible.*

Which Guide the unlearned, in any Division, can discern from false; or, know, and understand the decrees of such Guides better, than the Scriptures.

Or, which the Scriptures direct them to, for learning *Necessaries*,
§.39.n.2.

The Reply.

1. That Evidence of the Scriptures hath been the usual Plea of former
b Heresies,

2. That, as to the main and principle Articles of the Christian Faith, the sufficiency of the Rule of Scripture is not denied by Roman-Catholics; But only the clearness thereof, as to all mens capacities, questioned: and in this respect another Guide held necessary, §.40.n.2.

3d Reply, Concerning the Clearness of Scripture. That some of the Controversies in Religion, since the Scriptures written, have been concerning Points necessary.

That all more clear all Necessaries are in Scripture, the more necessary Christians have in the Church's judgment, §.42.

That there is no necessity, that all Necessaries be revealed in Scripture, §.43.

Because it is sufficient, if the Scriptures, for the things doubtful their in, direct by these Guides, §.43.

Sufficient, if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

That if such things be cleared in these Guides, by other

Guides, as by Tradition, though not by Scripture, §.44.

10. That particular Persons, or Churches, Part of the whole, are oblig'd to observe their Instructions, and Dispositions.

CONTENTS

OF THE

THIRD DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

Concerning an Ecclesiastical Guide, things generally agreed on by the two Churches.

Roman Catholics and Protestants agreed.

1. That the Scriptures are God's Word;
2. That these Scriptures (agreed on) are clearly declared;
3. That the Church, in no age, shall err in necessary things;
4. That the Church-Catholic is contrary to heretical, and Schismatical Churches, &c.
4. That Christ hath left in this Church Pastors and Teachers, to keep it from being tossed to and fro, and carried about, with every wind of Doctrine, &c.

CHAP. II.

The further Assertions of Catholics concerning the Infallibility of the Church-Guides, the extent thereof, and Subjection of particular Persons, or Churches, to them.

Roman Catholics further affirming.

5. The Church-Guides, as last assembled in a General Council, shall never err in their determining Points of necessary Faith,
6. Points necessary, and such as are only so, these absolutely required, but all very beneficial, to Salvation, &c.
7. Shall never err in them, nor be infallibly inspired to teach any new, but continually assisted in determining of what former Revelations, and Traditions, &c.
8. This, for knowing, what, on how many of former Councils have been lawfully General, or Obliging, a Christian may safely rely on the most general judgment of the Church, since the fixing of such Councils, &c.
9. That, in the absence of a considerable part of the Church-Government from some Council, yet their acceptance of its decrees, or concurrence with its Doctrines renders it equivalent to a Council General, &c.

2. Concerning Heresy and Schism in any departure from
these Canons.

Definition of the Church, its members of Faith, are Here, ick,

But yet: that difference of Opinions or Practices between co-ordinating Churches, may be without Heresy or Schism on any side; while the obligation to their being on both, from their common Superior, or from the whole, §. 23.

On the other side, the President, after the four first Propositions con-
ceded, then proceeding to qualify them.

6. Affirming the Church Catholick, or all particular Churches, of this present Age, are in the General, under the Name of *heretics*, dangerous to Salvation, grossly damnable, &c. §. 25. For that in *apostasy*, the most of *heresies* spring, from which Protestants dissent, were the *Antient* *Concils*, and *Prælatry*, at the coming of Luther. §. 26.

Extending universal acceptance to all particular Churches, and
Necessitating (and therefore) on them absolutely to
accept of the same, is a doctrine of a most dangerous and
erroneous nature.

. 0510. Allowing

The Contents.

- 9, 10. *Allowing Obedience also due to the Definitions and decrees of such Councils: But not, that of Affairs, but only of Non-contradiction.* §. 39. (Where, of the *Quality* of the Obedience yielded by the Church of England to the four first Councils) §. 40.
11. *Obedience of Non-contradiction; not generally; but where the Error of the Council not manifest, and intolerable.* §. 43. *Claiming also, where the Error manifest, to prefer, against such Council, to reform it, for themselves.* §. 44.
12. *The judgment also (as for themselves,) when there is or is not, such Error in Councils, left to particular Persons, or Churches.* §. 45.

CHAP. V.

2. And concerning the Nation of Heresy and Schism.

13. *Suitably to the Proceedings, Protestants declaring Heresy to be an error obstinately maintained against some Fundamental Article of the Faith; without allowing any certain Judge, what Articles are Fundamental, and consequently, what is Heresy.* §. 46.
14. *Declaring Schism, in respect of inferior, to be a separation counsel'd (§. 53.) Or, also (as some more straiten it,) a separation in Essentials.* (§. 55.) *From the Communion of other Churches, or of the Church Catholic: But leaving us no certain Judge, what points are Essentials; or, when the separation counsel'd; and consequently, when Schism: Unless, perhaps, be that separates, be made by them this Judge.*
- Again, enlarging Schism to Superiors also, so often us, by requiring unjust condonations of their Communion, they give their Subjects just cause of separation.* §. 61. *Where is examined: Whether the Ecclesiastical Superiors, when departing from without their Superiors, can become, in respect of their Subjects, guilty of Schism.* §. 63. n. r.

A brief Reflection on the former different Theſes of the two Churches concerning Church-Authority, and the Obedience due thereto. §. 64.

CHAP. VI.

The Face of the two present Churches; compar'd with that of the Ancient.

A Review, which of the two present Churches most resembleth the Ancient Catholic Church. §. 67.

Thee

The Rites of the Antient Catholick Church, shewing the Difference of the present Roman Church. §. 72. Of the present Protestants. §. 76.

CHAP. VII.

Whether the Church of England doth not require assent to her Articles of Religion.

Several Canons in her Synods seeming to require it. §. 83. n. 1.

The complaint of the Presbyterians, concerning it. §. 83. n. 4.

The Doctrine of her Divines. §. 84. n. 1.

Where, concerning the just importance of Negative Articles, §. 84. n. 1. and 85. n. 2. and concerning Conditional Assent. §. 84. n. 4. and 85. n. 10.

That to some of the 39 Articles Assent is due, and ought to be required. §. 85. n. 1.

That the Roman Church doth not require assent to all the Canons of her Councils as to points Fundamental; i. e. of any of which Points a Christian neophyte cannot be saved. §. 85. n. 4.

That obedience either of assent or non-contradiction, if required by the Church of England to all the 39 Articles, seems contrary to the Laws of the Church; and to the Protestant Principles, §. 85. n. 11.

CHAP. VIII.

The Eastern Churches consenting with the Roman.

The consent of the Doctrine and Practice of the modern Eastern Churches with the Occidental against Protestants, in the chief Points of present Controversie. 1. Transubstantiation, §. 158.

2. Adoration of the Eucharist, §. 159, 177. 3. Sa-

crifice of the Mass, §. 160. n. 1. & 177. 4. Invocation of Saints

§. 161. 5. Prayer for the souls of the departed, as betterable

thereby in their present condition, §. 162. 6. Communion in

one kinde, or intinct only, §. 163, 178. 7. A relative Venera-

tion of Images, or Pictures, Ibid. 8. Monastick Vows: and

marrying denied the Clergy, after their having taken Holy Orders,

§. 164 & 179. n. 1. 9. Auricular or Sacramental Confession,

§. 165, 179. n. 2.]

The Replies made hereto, by Protestants, considered, §. 182. &c.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

*Solutions of several Protestant Questions concerning the
Supreme Ecclesiastical Infallible Judge,
maintained in these Discourses.*

1. *Q. From whence we can be assured, that Councils are infallible, since neither the Texts of Scripture, the sense whereof is disputed; nor the Decree of any Council, whose erring is the thing questioned, can give such assurance?* §. 86.
2. *Q. From whence General Councils receive their Infallibility; such promise, if made at all, being made only to the Church diffusive; and not delegable, by this Church, to others: Or, if so; no such Delegation from the Universal Church appearing to have been, beforehand, made to all, or any, General Council?* §. 91.
3. *Q. How the Infallibility of General Councils is necessary for serviceable to the Church; without which Councils the Church subsisted, for several ages, most Orthodox?* §. 98.
4. *Q. How Lawfull General Councils; which experience hath shew'd, to have contradicted one another, can be all Infallible?* §. 100.
5. *Q. Lawfull General Councils being supposed to be liable to error in some things; how Christians can be assured, concerning any particular point, that in these Councils do not err?* §. 101.
6. *Q. Whilst such Councils are supposed Infallible; How, if they should not be so, can any error of theirs be rectified?* §. 101.
7. *Q. Whether such Councils; only when confirmed by the Pope; or also when yet unconfirmed by him, are infallible?* §. 104.
8. *Q. How the Pope's Confirmation can any way concern so such Councils; if it is non-erring; since, if it is erring before, it doth so still, though he approve it: but if orthodox before, it is so still, without approving it?* §. 105.
9. *Q. In which, (the Pope, or the Council;) this Infallibility lies? For, if in one of them, the other is needless: if in Both, then either of them sufficient: such qualities being indivisible, and without integral Parts?* §. 106.

CHAP. X.

10. *Q. If General Councils infallible; whether they are so in their conclusions only? which infers Enthusiasm, or new Revelation. Or, also in their premises and proofs? upon which, assent will be due to all their Arguments as well as Decrees?* §. 107.

12. *Q. How such infallibility of theirs differs from that of the Apostles? And the infallibility of their Decrees, from that of Scripture?*
§ 109.

1. Q. How many persons, or Guides, are fallible, can make up one infallible? §. 112.

14. Q. Supposing all lawful General Councils infallible; yet, how can any one know infallibly, which are lawful General Councils? The reason. Because for many conditions are required truly to make them such; in some one or other of which conditions, one can never be infallibly certain of any Council, that is truly no failed. § 14. ¶ 2.

CHAPTER XL

Solution of the Question touching the Resolution of a Divine Faith.

That the Object of a Divine Faith is always in it self most infal-

1. That the Object of a Divine Faith is always in it self most infallibly true. §. 123.
2. That Divine Faith always reflects in itself into a Divine Revelation as its proper Object, and then in which it chiefly depends and relies, as to its adherence in most confidence therein. §. 124.
- And that this Revelation must be one same one Revelation wherein it ultimately terminates and rests, as to any proof that can be thereof from any other Divine Revelation without a process in Infinity, or wheeling about in a Circle. §. 125.
- And that an Honour Tradition or Testimony is only an Introduction to a Divine Faith, no Object of it. §. 126.
3. That such Divine Faith is always wrought in Christians by the operation of Gods Spirit. §. 127.
- And that this Holy Spirit is no evidence or proof of the truth of such a Divine Faith either so alone, or joined with. §. 128.
- Neither any supernatural assistance that may accompany the Motives. §. 129.
4. That such a Divine Faith is also attainable without any extrinsecal infallible Introductive, or Proponent. Neither that it is necessary that all men, for having such a Divine and saving Faith, be first infallibly certain that the external Proponent thereof is infallible. §. 129. 3.
5. That there is a Rational and sufficiently certain Ground or Proof produced for this Faith, (which relies as to its Object only on Divine

Divine Revelation), and for all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church, which no other Religion besides Christianity, nor no other Sect, or seducing private Spirit in Christianity, can pretend to: viz. Tradition, as circumstantiated and qualified with the other commonly called Prudential Motives. §. 135.

II. 15. And that such a Rational Certainty or naturally infallible Ground of a Christian Faith, for this at least, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and consequently whatever is contained therein, infallible, is affirmed by Protestants. §. 136.

But further: That the same Certainty as to the Infallibility of the Guides of the Church in necessary is affirmed by Catholics; as this clearly revealed both in Scripture and by Tradition. Apostolical: from which Infallibility of the Church, other Church as them, they retain a firm faith of all those other points that are not in Scripture, or by Tradition, as to all men so evidently revealed, as Church-Infallibility is. In many of which points these others, who believe only Infallibility of Scripture, where its sense is doubtful are liable to miscarry. §. 140.

From the Precedents the Difficulties in the Objection cleared, and the Catholick's Resolution of Faith vindicated from being Circular. §. 143.

The Conclusion. Wherein, of the many advantages, of promoting their salvation lost by Protestants in persisting out of the Communion of the Roman Catholick Church, and rejecting the conduct of their Canonical Spiritual Guides. §. 144.

THE
CONTENTS
OF THE
FOURTH DISCOURSE.

Containing the SOCINIAN'S Apology
for the believing, and teaching, his Doctrine,
against former Church-Definitions, and pre-
sent Church-Authority, upon the Protestants
Grounds.

Divided into Five CONFERENCES.

THE FIRST CONFERENCE.

The Socinian's Protest and Plea for his not holding any thing con-
trary to the Holy Scriptures.

1. **T**hat he believes all contained in the Scriptures, in the Gods
Word; and therefore implicitly believes those truths, against
which he errs. §. 2.
2. That, also, he useth his best endeavour to find the true sense of
Scriptures: and, that more is not required of him from God for his
faith or salvation; than doing his best endeavour for attaining it.
§. 3.
3. That, as for an explicit faith required of some points necessary; he
is sufficiently assured; that this point concerning the Son's Con-
substantiality with the Father, as to the affirmative, is not so from the
Protestant's affirming all necessities to be clear in Scripture, even to
the unlearned; which this, in the affirmative, is not to him. §. 4.
4. That several express, and plain Scriptures do persuade him, that the
negative (if either) is necessary to be believed; and that from the
clearness of Scriptures, he hath as much certainty in this point, as
Protestants can have, from them, in some other, held against the com-
mon expressions of the former times of the Church. §. 6, 8.
5. That, for the right understanding of Scriptures, either he may be
certain of a just industry used; or else, that Protestants, in asserting
that

The Contents.

that the Scriptures are plain unto the industrious; and then that none are certain, when they have used a just industry; thus must still remain also uncertain in their faith; as not knowing, whether some defect in this their industry causeth them not to mistake the Scriptures; or whether of necessity it is so, that so and so of them is so, &c.

6. Lastly, that none have used more diligence in the search of Scripture, than the Socinians; as appears by their writings; adding themselves wholly to the Word of God; and yet suffering themselves to be any way byass'd by any other humane, either modern, or ancient, Authority. §. 9.

Where, The Protestant's, and Socinian's pretended Certainty of the sense of Scripture apprehended by them; and made the ground of their faith against the sense of the same Scripture declared by the major part of the Church is examined. §. 9.

CONFERENCE II.

The Socinians Protestants-Plea, For his not holding any thing contrary to the unanimous sense of the Catholick Church, so far as this can justly oblige.

1st. **T**hat an unanimous Consent of the whole Catholick Church in all ages, such as the Protestants require for the proving of a point of faith to be necessary, can never be shewed, concerning the point of Consubstantiality. §. 14.

And that the consent, to such a doctrine, of the major part is no argument sufficient, since the Protestants deny the like consent valid for several other points. §. 14.

2. That, supposing an unanimous consent of the Church Catholick of all ages in this point, yet from hence a Christian hath no security of the truth thereof according to Protestant Principles, if this point (whether way sever held) be a non-necessary for that in such, it is said, the whole Church may err. §. 15.

3. That this Article being, in the affirmative, but in the Creed proves is not (as to the affirmative) a necessary. §. 16.

1st. Because not originally in the Creed, but added by a Council; to which Creed if one Council may add, so may another of equal authority, in any age, whatever restraints be made by a former Council.

The Contents.

2. Because several Articles of the latter Creed are affirmed by Protestants not necessary to be believed, but upon a previous conviction, that they are divine revelations. §. 16.
3. Lastly, That, though the whole Church delivers, for truth, in any point, the contrary to that he holds, he is not obliged to resign his judgment to her's, except conditionally, and with this reservation, unless on the other side, there appear evidence to him in God's Word. Now, of the evidence of Scripture in this point on his side, that he hath no doubt. §. 17.

The III. CONFERENCE.

His Plea, for his not holding any thing contrary to the Definitions of lawful General Councils, the full conditions thereof observed.

That he conceives he owes no obedience to the Council of Nice.

1. Because this cannot be proved to have been a lawful General Council with so much certainty, as is necessary for the ground of his faith, as appears by those many questions mentioned by Mr. Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, and other Protestants wherein he must first be satisfied, concerning it: which see Disc. 1. §. 26. &c.
2. Because though it were a General Council, yet it might err even in necessities, if it were not universally accepted; as he can shew, it was not.
3. That, though yielded to be generally accepted, it might err still in non-necessaries; and that Protestants cannot prove this point to be otherwise.
4. That the Leaders of this Council were plainly a party, contesting this, for many years before, with the other side, condemned by them; and were judges in their own cause.
5. All these exceptions cancelled, and Obedience granted due to this Council; yet, that so, there is due to it not that of assent, but only of silence. §. 19.
6. But yet not that of silence neither from him; considering his present persuasion, that indeed the affirmation in this point is an error manifest, and intolerable: concerning which matter his party having long complained to their Superiors, and produced sufficient evidence; yet these have proceeded to no redress of it. §. 20.
7. But yet that he will submit to the judgement of a future Council, if it, rightly considering the reasons of his tenent, decree that which is according to God's Word, and be he convinced thereof, §. 22.

The Contents.

The IV CONFERENCE.

His Plea, for his not being guilty of *Heresie*.

- T**hat he cannot rightly, according to Protestant Principles, be accused as guilty of *Heresie*, for several reasons.
1. Because, Protestants holding *Heresie* to be an obdurate defence of some error against a fundamental, he thinks, from hence his sentence freed from being an *Heresie*, as long as in silence he retains it, unless he engage further to a publick pertinacious maintaining thereof. §. 23.
 2. Fundamentals varying according to particular persons, and sufficient proposal; none can conclude this point, in the affirmative, to be, as to him, a fundamental; or, of the truth of which he hath had a sufficient proposal.
 3. That a lawful General Council's declaring some point *Heresie*, doth not necessarily argue, that it is so; because they may err in Fundamentals; or at least in distinguishing them from other points. §. 26.
 4. That he can have no autocatacrisis, or obstinacy, in a dissenting from their Definitions, till he is either actually convinced, or at least hath had a sufficient proposal either of the truth of such point defined: Or that such Councils have authority to require submission of judgement, and assent, to their Definitions: of which conviction, or sufficient proposal (that varies much, according to the differing conditions of several persons) as to himself, none can judge save himself: and, consequently, neither can they judge of his guilt of *Heresie*. 1b.

The V. CONFERENCE.

His Plea, for his not being guilty of *Schism*.

1. **T**hat the Socinian Churches have not forsaken the whole Church, Catholick, or the external Communion of it: but only left one part of it that was corrupted; and reformed another part, (i. e.) themselves. Or, that he, and the Socinian Churches, being a part of the Catholick, they have not separated from the whole, because not from themselves. §. 28.
 2. That, their separation being for an error unjustly imposed upon them as a condition of Communion, the *Schism* is not theirs, who made the separation; but theirs, who caused it. §. 29.
- Besides that, what ever the truth of things be; yet so long as they are required by any Church to profess they believe, what they do not, their separation cannot be said causeless, and so, *Schism*. §. 32.

2. That.

The Contents.

3. That, though he, and his party had forsaken the external Communion of all other Churches; yet not the internal; in which they remain still united to them: both in that internal Communion of Charity, in not condemning all other Churches as non-Catholic; and in that of Faith, in all Essentials, and Fundamentals, and in all such points, wherein the Unity of the Church Catholic consists. §. 30.
4. That the doctrine of Consubstantiality for which they departed is denied by them to be any Fundamental; nor can the Churches, from which they depart for it, be a competent Judge against them that it is so. §. 34.
5. That, though they are separatists from the Roman, yet not from the Reformed Churches, which Churches leave men to the liberty of their own judgment; nor require any internal assent to their doctrines (in which thing they blame the tyranny of the Roman Church) save only conditional; if any be convinced of the truth thereof; or, not convinced of the contrary. §. 35.
6. In fine; that for enjoying, and continuing in, the Protestant Communion he maketh as full a profession of conformity to her doctrines, as Mr. Chillingworth hath done in several places of his book, which yet was accepted as sufficient. §. 41.

THE CONFERENCE.

The Place for his not being guilty.

THE

THE

THE
PRINCIPAL CONTENTS
IN THE
EXPLICATIONS

Concerning the

RESOLUTION of FAITH.

That Church-Infallibility as assisted by the Holy Ghost is a Divine Revelation: Delivered to us both by Scriptures, and Tradition.

p.419.

That Tradition, qualified with the Motives, is a sufficiently certain and self-evident proof of Church-Infallibility. Ibid.

How Church-Infallibility is necessary, notwithstanding a sufficient evidence for some things in Tradition p.419.425.

That the Exercise of Private Mens judgments in the discovery of Church-Infallibility well consists with Submission of their judgments to It, discovered. p.425.

That this Infallibility by Catholicks is placed in a lawful General Council; or a General Consent of the Guides of the Church. p.425.

That a Divine Revelation is always the Object; but not also the Proof or Evidence of the Object, of a Divine Faith: For, so would be a process in Divine Revelations in infinitum. Yet that a Divine Faith hath always a rational evidence; that the Object of it is a Divine Revelation. p.419.

That one Divine Revelation as to a Divine Faith may be the proof or evidence of another, but not so, of all. Or, That a Divine Faith always rests in some ultimate Divine Revelation without having any further Divine Revelation to prove, or on which to ground, it. p.427. 431. 436. 438.

That one Divine Revelation may be proved by another, or the other by it, as the one or other happens to be to a person first known. p.432.

That neither Church-Infallibility is a Necessary Præcognitum to believing the Canon of Scripture; Nor Scripture to believing Church-Infallibility, with a Divine Faith. p.425.

In what manner a Divine Faith is said to be, or to include, an infallible Assent p.423.

Ther

The Contents.

That no Assent hath any greater Certainty than the Evidence on which it is grounded. p.424. E H T

That a Divine Faith hath always a prudential Motive or Introduction of its Objects, being a Divine Revelation, but this is not necessarily always the greatest certainty thereof, that may be had. p.435.

That the Belief of the Truth of things related may be much either stronger or weaker, than the belief of the veracity of the Relater. But not the Certainty of the Truth of them any higher than that of the Relater's Veracity is, if the knowledge of them be received only from him. p.420.

That the Holy Spirit is always the Efficient in the Soul of a Divine and Saving Faith. p.442. But not the Evidence or Proof thereof to others; or to our selves, so as to demonstrate this to others. p.440-445.

Where. That the Holy Spirit may enlighten some men's Understandings in those things, that are manifested by Right Reason to others. p.441.

The Solution of several Questions relating to the Operation of the Holy Spirit in the production of a Divine Faith. p.440.

No Circle in a Catholick's Resolution of his Faith, p.426, 437, 443, 448.

Errata.

PAge 7. line 8. read 16, 17. p. 14. l. 26. r. c. 2. p. 35. l. 16. r. read 10 lb. marg. r. *diffusivus*. p. 50. l. 34. dele *it*. p. 52. marg. r. p. 80. l. 32. dele 4. p. 93. l. 7. r. C. Church. p. 226. l. 19. r. *seizure*. p. 275. l. ult. r. *divino*. p. 311. l. 31. dele *and his faith failed not*. p. 345. l. 31. r. [solum] p. 346. l. 1. r. *magna*. p. 349. marg. r. & 134. p. 350. marg. r. §. 135. p. 447. l. 23. r. *and affirmed*. Pref. p. 6. l. 27. r. *Divine*.

THE
FIRST DISCOURSE:
 Relating, and Considering the Various
 Judgments of Learned Prote-
 stants concerning the
ECCLESIASTICAL GUIDE.

CHAP. I.

*That the Promise of Infallibility belongs to the Guides of
 the Church-Catholick,*

*The Church-Catholick granted by all, in some sense, unerrable in
 Fundamentals, for ever. §. 1.*

*I. Some Protestant Divines granting the Church-Catholick un-
 errable in Fundamentals, or Necessaries; but, not as a Guide, §. 3.*

*Reply. That the Divine Promises of Indefeasibility, or not err-
 ing in Necessaries, belong to the Church-Catholick, as a Guide; or,
 to the Guides of the Church-Catholick, §. 6.*

First, That the Church-Catholick of any Age what-
 ever is unerrable in Fundamentals, or absolute
 Necessaries to Salvation, both by Roman-Cath-
 olicks and Protestants, is granted; for otherwise,
 in some Age, there may be no Church-Cath-
 olick; Errour in such Fundamentals destroying
 the very Being of a Church.

But when, from the Church, Roman-Catholicks do ascend
 to the Governours or Guides thereof (to whom our Lord depart-
 ing hence committed his Church;) That they are also, by our
 Lords promise and assistance, unerrable in their Decrees; They,

at least when assembled in a lawfull General Council of them (such as the times of their convening do permit); unerrable, at least so far, as to *Necessaries*; Here the *Protestants* make a stop; and seem to differ one from another in their Judgments: Taking several ways whereby they abridge and shorten the Church-Infallibility that is maintained by *Catholics*. Thus, these Divines will allow Some Christians, either *Shepherds*, or *Sheep*, for ever infallible or unerring in *Necessaries*; but uncertain, who: Or Some *Pastors* infallible, but only those Primitive Ones, the *Apostles* (who left behinde them a *Rule*) not their *Successors*: Or Their *Successors* also, but these conditionally so: Or Some *Successors* always absolutely infallible; but not any known distinct *Body*, or *Community* of them: Or Some visible, united, and distinct *Body* of them: So this be not ty'd to the greatest or most dignified, Number of them; but left indifferently Hereditable, Sometimes to the meanest, and fewer: Or also the *Supremest* and *Greatest* *Body* of them thus Infallible; but when their Acts are confirmed by such an Attestation of the Church Universal, as that none or no considerable Party oppose them. All these Degrees I shall, successively, passe through, and discover to you; leaving, as I go, some necessary remarks upon them.

§. 3.

|| See Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 154, 251, 252, 330 514, 517, 555 Whistler c. 9, & 20.

|| See below §. 31, 38 — Disc. 3. d. 36.

§. 4.

Mr. Chillingworth, in his Answer to F. Knot; and after him Dr. Hammond, in his Answer to the Exceptions made against the Lord Falklands Discourse of Infallibility, with their followers in this point, (among whom I number the two late *Repliers*||) affirm indeed, the Church-Catholick (according to the former Proposition) to be always unerrable in Fundamentals or Necessaries. But then; by Church-Catholick they mean such a Church, as neither is, nor can be any Guide to us; carefully distinguishing between the Church-Catholick, and her General Councils; and holding, that, even in Fundamentals, all her Councils whatever (except such, as are, in their way, universally accepted||) may err, though she cannot.

To this purpose, See Mr. Chillingworth. (chap. 3. §. 39.) discoursing on this manner, — I must tell you, you are too bold in taking that which no man grants you; that the Church-Catholick is an infallible Director in Fundamentals. For if she were so, then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but also learn of her what is Fundamental, and take all for Fundamental, which she delivers to be such. In the performance whereof; if I knew any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church. But, good Sir, you must needs do us this favour, to be so strict; as to distinguish between, being infallible in Fundamentals, and being an infallible Guide in Fundamentals. That she shall be always a Church infallible in Fundamentals we easily grant; for it comes to no more but this: that there shall be always a Church. But that there shall be

be always such a Church, which is an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, this we deny. For this cannot be without settling a known Infallibility in some one known Society of Christians (as the Greek, or the Roman, or some other Church) by adhering to which Guide, men might be guided to believe aright in all Fundamentals.

Much what the same he saith, chap. 2. §. 139. — You must know, there is a wide difference between, being infallible in fundamentals, and being an infallible Guide even in fundamentals. Dr. Potter saith, That the Church is the former: That is, there shall be some men in the world whilst the world lasts, which err not in fundamentals: for otherwise there would be no Church. But we utterly deny the Church to be the latter: for to say so, were to oblige our selves to find some certain Society of men, of whom we may be certain that they neither do, nor can err in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is Fundamental: and consequently to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things, which she proposeth, and requires to be believed. And chap. 5. §. 60. — You suppose untruly, that there is any that visible Church, I mean any visible Church of one Denomination, which cannot err in Points Fundamental.

[Where you may observe: that Mr. Chillingworth taketh the Church-Catholik, that is infallible, only for some certain persons, in some place or other, professing Christianity, who, whilst the world lasts, *de facto* do not err in Fundamentals; and that, as he affirms, no Church of one Denomination to be infallible in Fundamentals; so he holds, neither any Council, nor any visible Body of Ecclesiastical Magistrates whatsoever, or how far soever extended, that proposeth to Christians matters of Religion, to be infallible in Fundamentals; as you may see quite through the third chap. of his Book; and as is manifest also from his reasons against the one, which are of like force against the other. Therefore, though he frequently names Church of one Denomination, and not Councils, yet you shall find that to [this Church of one Denomination errable] he opposeth not [Councils un-erring] but only [some men in the World, whilst the world lasts, *de facto* not erring:] and to these, it is, and not to Councils, or any Ecclesiastical Governors that he applyeth our Saviours promise. Yet, what hinders, but that the Church-Catholik, in some times, as it stands contradistinct to Heretical and Schismatical Churches, may be in this sense a Church of one Denomination? Nay, any Church, that is so united, as to give Laws, and to have all its members involved in one external Communion, though it be an aggregate of many particular Churches, and those in several Nations, truly is so: and the Church-Catholik always is but One, as we confess it in our Creed: But one Body it is, and

§. 3.

therefore not incapable of one name, or denomination; and hence, all the *Western Churches*, in the times of *Luther*, having only one external Communion, may be said to be a Church of one Denomination, and so were for a long time both the *Eastern* and *Western*. This Caution I thought meet here to give you, that his seeming limitation [of one Denomination] may not deceive you. □

§. 6.

I c. 1. §. 5, 6.

P. 23.

After him, thus also Dr. *Hammond*, in defence of the Lord *Falkland's* Discourse, against the Exceptions ||; — I shall (saith he) thus far consent with you. First; That the universal Church is in *Fundamentals* infallible, — But then, this Infallibility must signifie no more, or is to be no farther extended, than that *Christ* doth, and will so defend his Church, that there shall be for ever, till the end of the world, a Church Christian on the earth; i. e. that the whole Church shall not, at once, make an universal defection, err from the foundation, or do any thing, by which there shall cease to be a Church on the earth, But then alty. I say, that this very universal Church, though it be in this sense infallible in *Fundamentals*, is not yet a Rule, or Canon, or Guide, or Judge infallible, even in *Fundamentals*; visible it is, infallible it is, but it is not a visible Judge, or Rule infallible. Thus Dr. *Hammond*.

Again here you see, these Authors make a distinction between the Church-Catholick, and the Body of her Governors, or her General Council, giving Laws; and, in allowing Infallibility in Necessaries to the Church-Catholick, remove it from the General Councils thereof, because they think it not safe to allow the Church-Catholick, taken in its guiding part, to be unerrable.

§. 7.

Reply.

But this their denying, the Church-Catholick to be unerrable in her Governors, and as she is a Guide, seems utterly contrary both to our Saviour's Promises, made to her in the Scriptures; and also, to the Concessions of other Modern Learned Protestants. (which see below §. 15 & c. 22, & c.)

First, As concerning our Saviour's Promises (from which is collected the Church's Indefeasibility in necessities) all, or mozt of them are expressly made to the Guides of the Church; and therefore to the Church, as a Guide; that so these Guides might be set for ever, to all Nations, as a City on a Hill; and as a Candle in a Candlestick ||.

Mat. 5. 14, 15

* See (Mat. 28. 19, 20.) Upon our Saviour's sending his Successors abroad to teach the Nations, his promising to be with them [i. e. with the Teachers of these Nations] to the end of the world.

* See (John 14. 16, 26. — 16. 15. Compared with Acts 15. 28. — 1 Joh. 5. 20, 27. — 1 Cor. 12. 7, 8.) his promising first, and after

after sending them a *ἑταῖρος*, [i.e. an Assistant] that should abide with them for ever; to teach them all things; and to bring all things to their remembrance. For ever: i.e. both with the Apostles, and with their Successors: Not with the Apostles only: For then what would become of the Nations, that, after their times, were still to be instructed? especially, when any Controversies should arise concerning the understanding of the Apostles Writings: which Writings are mis-understandable it seems in things necessary; For St. Peter saith, in his time, the unlearned wrested them to their own destruction ||, that effect not following upon wresting things unnecessary: || 2 Pet. 3.16. Therefore, that Assistant needfull not only to the Apostles in their Writing, what he taught them; but to their Successors also, in interpreting what they wrote.

* See (Mat. 18. v. 20. compared with v. 17, 18.) his promising, that when they were gathered together in his name [to hear the Causes brought to the Church: brought to her still daily, notwithstanding the Scriptures,] he himself would be in the midst of them, and would ratifie in heaven, what they should, upon earth; which implieth also, that he would assist them on earth, (at least when this their gathering together makes up the supreme, and unappealable, Church-authority,) to do, as to the main, both what was meet to be submitted to by those whom he sent to their Tribunal; and what was meet to be ratified by the heavenly Tribunal. But if, after the Rule of Scripture, the necessity of such Tribunals ceased, why are these after ward continued, and, in Controversies of Faith, appealed, repaired, to?

* See (Mat. 16. 18, 19.) his promising "Tu es Petrus & super hanc Petram [in the Syriack, our Lords language, Kipha & super hunc Kipha] edificabo Ecclesiam meam: & porte Inferi non prevalebunt adversus eam. Et tibi dabo claves Regni Cœlorum, &c. Non prevalebunt, neither adversus Ecclesiam; nor much less, adversus Petrum, or those Petra, on which it is built || and the persons || See Eph. 2.20. to whom our Lord hath committed the Keyes of the Gates of Heaven, to let others in thither. Surely, such a storm would sooner beat down some of the Church, than this Rock and Foundation of it. And, if these that have the Keyes of Heaven should be conquered by, and shut up within, Hell-Gates, how can any of the People enter into Heaven without them. If the Church stands, the Rock must stand, that supports it; If any enter into Heaven, those that have the Keyes must be there too to open them the door. Our good Lord then hath here engaged that the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against those, to whom he gave the Keys [i.e. against the Clergy;] nor against the Church built by, and upon, them. And * see

(Luc.

(*Luk. 23. 31.*) the not failing of St. *Peter's* Faith prayed for, by our Lord, in order to *establishing his Brethren.*

* See (*1 Tim. 3. 15.*) *the Church* (unlimited to the Apostles days) said to be the *Pillar, and ground of Truth*; surely this from its Teachers being so, For so the Apostle elsewhere, using the same Metaphor, frequently calls these Teachers (*Gal. 2. 9.*) *Pillars*; (*Eph. 2. 20.*) *Foundations, and Grounds*: amongst which Teachers Timothy being admitted, is warned here to be very circumspect, and careful of his behaviour: And * see (*2 Tim. 2. v. 19.* compared with *ver. 16, 17, 20.*) *the Foundation of God*, [the Church, and its Doctrine, and its children] *standing sure*: notwithstanding that *Hymeneus*, and some others (as Vessels in this great house of God, not of Gold, and Honour, but of Earth and Dishonour) *had erred from the Truth of God.*

* See (*Eph. 4. 11, 13.*) his giving these Teachers, *that the world should not be tossed to, and fro with every wind of Doctrine.* In whose Doctrine therefore, in order to this end, this Doner hath fixed some stability; neither can it be applied only to the Apostles or their times, seeing that the experience of so many various winds of Doctrines, even since all their Writings, and concerning the sense of their Writings (see *2 Pet. 3. 16.*) Blowing in the Church, and carrying the unstable to and fro, argues the same necessity of such *Doctors* still. And * see *Rev. 1. 13, 16.* Where our Saviour (to denote his perpetual presence to these succeeding Teachers, and Governors of his Church) after all the times of all the Apostles, save St. *John*, is described, though in Glory, yet walking in the midst of the seven Mother-Churches of *Asia*, and holding their Bishops in his hands.

And therefore he hath commanded that an Obedience be yielded to these Governors proportionable to his assistance; and that those, *who will not bear them*, should be reckoned as *Heathens or Publicans*; our Lord being *in the midst* of their Assemblies; and ratifying *in Heaven*, what their Sentence binds, or looseth, *on Earth*†; And declaring concerning them||; *that he that heareth them, heareth him*: From which may be gathered; that that Clergy, who have still the same mission from him, may require the same Audience in his stead.

After all these proofs here may not be omitted the frequent Injunction of the Apostle to the Pastors, and people, of the several Churches he had founded. — * *1 Cor. 1. 10.* “*That they should all say one thing, and that there should be no schisms among them; but that they should be perfect in one sense, and one knowledge.*” * *Phil. 1. 27.* — “*That they converse worthy of the Gospel of Christ; stand fast in one spirit; Be of one mind; labouring together for the Faith of*”

† *Mat. 18. 17,*
18, 20.
|| *Luk. 10. 16.*

"the Gospel. * Phil. 2.2,3.—"That they be of one meaning;
 "having the same charity; of one mind; agreeing in one; nothing
 "done by contention, neither by vain glory. And c.3.16.—"That
 "they should continue in the same Canon or Rule [i.e. in the same
 sense thereof; otherwise their Rule is not the same, though the
 words be.] * Rom. 12.16.—"That they should be of one mind,
 "in unum consensum, consenting, and following along, with the hum-
 "ble; not wise in their own conceits. * Rom. 17.17.—"That they
 "should mark those, that make dissensions, and scandals, contrary to
 "the doctrines, which they had learned, and avoid them. * 1. Cor.
 14.32,33.—"That the Spirits of the Prophets [much more of o-
 "thers] are subject to the Prophets: And, God, not the God of dis-
 "sention, but of Peace. Now, this precept, as you see so of-
 ten inculcated, how can it be observed, unless there be in the Church
 some persons whose Judgment, Doctrine, Faith, Spirit, all the rest
 are to follow and conform to? And then, unless these be their spi-
 rituall Guides and Governours (as it is plainly said of them, Heb.
 13.7.—"Whose faith follow)? For, who can it be else? And then,
 in these Guides also differing and dissenting among themselves, un-
 less it be those united in the most General Councils or Body, gather-
 ed of them; And, if here also some dissentients, unless we follow
 the Superior, the Major, the much more valuable Body and Com-
 munity thereof. Else, where two particular persons, or Churches,
 happen to be of a contrary mind or opinion, and that, in a matter
 of Faith, and much consequence, how can it be decided, in these
 their equally-resolute persuasions, which is to yeeld to the other?
 that so they may obey the Apostles Precept, and become of one sense,
 or of one mind, (without which also Charity between them is
 not long-liv'd?) Or, Are they both to yeeld to one another? But
 then, their Opinions, only exchanged, will still remain contrary.

C H A P. II.

That the Promise of Infallibility, made to the Apostles and their Successors, is not Conditional, but Absolute.

Several Limitations of Protestants, concerning these Promises.

1. *That they were made only to the Apostles, §. 8.*

2. *Or made to all the succeeding Church-Guides, but conditional, §. 12.*

Reply. That our Lords Promise of Indeficiency in Necessaries was not made to the Apostles only, but to their Successors, §. 9. And to their Successors, not conditional, but absolute, §. 14. n. 1.

§. 8.

¶ *Chillingw.*

p. 92. 115. 19.

— *Stillingfl.*

p. 256, 258,

259, 519.

IN Answer to these Texts : some of the Reformed || would restrain these *absolute* Promises only to the Apostles, or first Promulgators of the Gospel, for this reason : because no need that these promises should be extended to any more. For, by these first Guides was a written Rule left, for all succeeding times clear, and plain, even to the *unlearned*, and to all that use *common reason*, in all *necessary* points of Faith ; and therefore, that all Controversies, which these plain, and clear Scriptures, intelligible to every one, decide not, are not Controversies in any point *necessary* ; and need not to be decided ; nor do Christians, now having an *infallible*, and *plain Rule* for Necessaries, need afterwards, besides this, another *living, unerrable, Guide* in them.

§. 9.

Reply.

1.

But such an Answer (which shall be more strictly examined in the conclusion of the 2d Disc. §. 38. &c.) || 1st. Seems not any way sufficient to satisfy the former *Texts* (as hath been shewed already, in the Explication of them) ; which *Texts* do promise to the world's end not a *Rule* only, but *Persons*, sent to preserve us from every wind of Doctrine ; and so do command *Obedience*, not to a *Rule* only, but to *Persons* expounding it, under pain of being *bound in Heaven*, when these persons *bind* us upon *Earth* ; an authority exercised, not only by the Apostles ; but, (upon the strength of these, and the like, *Texts* extended beyond the former Limitation,) by their Successors also ; Only, this Order is required to be observed in our *Obedience* ; that we perform it in the first place to the present *supreme Church-authority* ; and, then also, to inferior particular persons, or Churches, only as they are conformable to, and united with, the *Supreme, or whole* ; who other wise (as experience shews) may

may err even in Fundamentals; and so our obedience to them rule us.

Nor 2ly seems such answer sufficient to satisfy the Necessities of the times following the Apostles; wherein, whether there have not risen controversies, notwithstanding the clearness of the rule left us, some of which have been in matters necessary, and wherein the people greatly needed the sure directions of their spiritual Guides, I leave to your Judgment, if you please to reflect on, either the old *Arrian, Nestorian, Pelagian*: or the new *Socinian, Solifidian, Church-Anarchical*, (both *anti-episcopal*, and also *anti-presbyteral*), errors; all maintain'd by such, who have presumed, as much as any, that they have *common reason* to understand plain Scriptures; Nay; who account these so clear on their own side, as to appeal, solely, to them, and to decline a trial by any other way, save by the Scriptures only. Adde to this, that several such strange, and damnable Opinions arose, after this Rule written, even in the *Apostolical times*: From which Errors, and Heresies, from time to time springing up, the Church, by the intervening definitions, and diligent search of the Rule, and traditive Exposition thereof, made in those supremest Ecclesiastical Courts that the times afforded, and not by the clearness of the Rule It self left to private Judgments, hath been hitherto preserved.

Mean-while, what satisfaction, or comfort can a Christian, in these present distractions of the Church, receive from such persons: who, when asked, whom we shall have recourse to, for ending of our controversies? in the 1st place tell us, || — * *That these, if clear Scripture, intelligible to every one, decide them not, are not controversies in any thing necessary, and so needless to be ended; [and therefore one would think it not much material also, on what side they are held].* Again; — * *That the Plea for an infallible Guide, to secure us from wandering out of the way to Heaven, is invalidated by the plainness and easiness of the way, which we cannot miss, unless we will.* And, when we are (upon this) now become secure; then 2ly, changing their former note, tell us: That some of the present Controversies are such, (For example the Controversie of *Transubstantiation, Saint-Invocation, and Images*;) as that, unless we believe them on that side as the Protestants state them, we become, if we practise according to our belief, guilty of most gross idolatry: (and, if it be idolatry, surely then it destroys the very essentials, or being, of a Church). 3ly, And then again (that we, in such a danger, may not think of retiring to, and relying upon, our Guides), in the third place tell us; that, in the not seeing this Rule of Scripture to be clear, and manifest, in these

2.
§. 10.

§. 11.

|| *Chillingw.*
p. 115. & 92.
— *Whitby*
p. 104. & 8.

Controversies, on the Protestant side; and in the not perceiving the Protestant Reasons brought for it to be Demonstrations; both those great *Councils*, that have defined the contrary to the Protestants persuasions, and the *greatest part* of Christianity now follows these Councils, all (Scripture being, in these, supposed for a *Rule*) either do want, or do not use *common Reason*.

§. 12.

|| §. I.

|| Chillingw.
p. 176. Still.
p. 311, 319,
320.

|| p. 130. §. 7,
8.

This of their first Answer; retraining these Texts, and our Lord's Promises of Infallibility only to the Apostles, and committing the succeeding times only to the Infallibility of the Apostles *Writings*. But yet, these men not being secure here, whilst some of the Texts (as hath been shewed) clearly enough promise Divine assistance also to the Apostles Successors; (which assistance can be none, or nothing worth, if not extended so far, as to preserve these Successors unerring in *Necessaries*); they yet further allow, from these Texts, a Promise of *Indefeasibility* in *Necessaries* to be made, as to the Catholick Church of all Ages after the Apostles, taken in general, (as it is set down in the first Proposition ||); So, not only to *her*, but to *her Guides* also, and *Clergy*; But then, they state these Promises, as made to the Guides, not to be *absolute* (as they are to the Church) but *conditional* only ||: not that *de facto* they shall in necessities never erre: but, on some *conditions* perform'd, be secure from such Error; which condition they endeavour to shew also out of these Texts, where such Promises are made. As* out of that, *John* 14. 16. — And 16. 23. — *The Comforter shall abide with you for ever, — and lead you into all truth*: True, say they; *if you love me, and keep my Commandments* [as immediatly goes before *Jo.* 14. 15.] * Out of that, *Mat.* 28. 20. — *I will be with you unto the end of the world*; True; *If you teach what I have commanded you*. — * Out of that, *Luke* 10. 16. — *He that heareth you, heareth me*; True; so often as ye speak my words, not your own. Therefore thus Mr. Chillingworth, where he sets down several irrational ways (as he calls them) of ending a Controversie ||, descants on these, and such like, Scriptures: — *We could* (saith he) *refer the matter to any Assembly of Christians assembled in the name of Christ; seeing it is Written: Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. We may refer it to any Priest, because it is written, The Priests lips shall preserve knowledge. The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's Chair, &c. To any Preacher of the Gospel, to any Pastor, or Doctor: for to every one of them Christ hath promised, he will be with them always, even unto the end of the world; and of every one of them it is said; he that heareth you, heareth me, &c. To any Bishop,*

Bishop, or Prelate; for it is written, Obey your Prelates; and again; He hath given Pastors, and Doctors, &c. lest we should be carried about with every wind of Doctrine. To any particular Church of Christians, seeing it is a particular Church which is called, The House of God, a Pillar, and Ground of Truth: and seeing of any particular Church it is written—He that heareth not the Church, let him be unto thee as a Heathen, and a Publican. But these Means Mr. Chillingworth disallows, because (saith he) they would fail us, and contradict themselves.

This then they say; that, as these Scripture-promises are applied to the *Catholick Church* in general of all, or any, Age after the Apostles, they grant them *absolute*; viz: That a *Being* of the *Catholick Church de facto* shall never fail, or expire: But as applied to any *particular Churches*, or their *Guides*, since it is certain, that such particular, Persons, and Churches may err even in Fundamentals, and do sometimes contradict one another, the Promises made to them must be understood to be only *conditional*; and that, before that any yield up, from these Texts, any Obedience to them, either of *assent*, or also (if in a matter of great moment) of *non-contradiction*, he must first look to it, whether they have performed the *condition* of the promised assistance (*i. e.* kept themselves to Christ's words:—*kept his Commandments, &c.*): wherein also he cannot take theirs, but must use his own, Judgment; and thus are these promises voided, as to any *certain* benefit, that the Subjects of the Church can expect, by them; and as to any *certain* Obedience, which the Clergy can require, for them.

§. 13.

To this way of expounding these Texts; whereby in making the promises to belong *conditionally* to every man of the Clergy, they would make them belong, *absolutely*, to none of them, I return this Answer.

1st. That, by their representing Christ's promises only conditional in the manner above-mentioned, they seem to unsettle the very Foundations of Christianity; and to take from it a *certain*ty of its *Faith*, of which they never intended to deprive it; whilst, from these Texts so expounded, we can have no certainty of the *Infallibility* of the Apostles themselves (to whom these things were said) unless we be first assured of their performance of the *Condition*.

2^{ly}. Seeing that themselves collect from these Texts an *absolute* promise of an *indefectibility*, as to the Knowledge, and belief of all *Necessaries* (which is the same, as an *Infallibility*, or actual security of never erring, in *Necessaries*) made to the *Church-Catholick* in general;

§. 14. n. 1.

Reply.

|| §. 12.

and seeing they do gather this from those Texts, where (as I have shewed) the promises are directed to the *Clergy*: Therefore, first, hence it seems most rationally conclusive; that though there be not a *disjunctive* indeficiency, so that no single *Clergy-man* is unerrable (which shall be granted them); yet there is at least a *conjunctive* absolute non-failing, as to all *Necessaries*, in the *Clergy*, some way, or other. Especially if we consider, that the Church is a *Body* constituted in a *regular* Government, and doth, and must, always consist of *Pastors*, and *People*; Of *Pastors* preaching the Word; and administering the Sacraments unto the *People*; and celebrating a publick Service of God in their Congregations; and, in such a constitution thereof, who can conceive a *People*, orthodox in *Necessaries*, governed at the same time by an apostatized *Clergy*? From a *Church*, then, granted *never failing*, or erring (and that is, *infallible*) in *necessaries*, I say, it follows most rationally, that there must be always a *Clergy* so too. Nor can any justify their drawing from the same words (directed chiefly to the *Clergy*) a *certain*, and *absolute* indefectibility of the *Church*; and yet only a *conditional* one of the *Clergy*; as neither can they, with reason, where the same duty (as that, *Mat. 28. 20. The Baptizing, and Teaching of all Nations*) is charged upon the future *Clergy*, as well as on the *Apostles*, make the Promise of assistance of the discharge of such duty (the least of which assistances imaginable is, that they shall not mis-instruct these Nations in *Necessaries*) *absolute* to the *Apostles*; *conditional* to their followers; and yet again absolute to the following Church, taken indeterminately and in General.

§. 14. n. 2.

This (from §. 3.) is spoken to those Protestant-Divines, who though they make a Promise of Indefectibility (or Infallibility in *Necessaries*), *absolute* to the Church-Catholic; yet affirm it to be, to the Church's *Clergy*, even taken in the Supreme Consultations and meetings of it, only *conditional*; which Promise of absolute Indefectibility, being thus extended to the *Church*, but withheld from the *Clergy*, though it implies still an infinite benefit, and favour to some *particulars*, yet seems to afford very little consolation to the whole Body of Christianity in General, being a promising no more than this, That, in all Ages to the end of the World, there shall be some men in it, that shall, (not reach, but only) retain so much faith, or divine truth, as thereby to be saved: which thing may be, where is no preaching; no Administration of the Sacraments; (which, yet, are Protestants notes of a Church,) and indeed no external visible Church at all: which thing may be, though all the *Clergy* do Apostatize, if at least some few *Laicks* continue Orthodox.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

That not some Inferiour or smaller part of the Clergy, but the Superiour and Major Part, is that Guide to whom the Promises belong.

II. Other Protestant Divines granting, the Clergy, (some or other of them) always unerring in Necessaries: but this not, necessarily, the Superiour, or major part of them, §. 15.

Reply. That the subordinate Clergy can be no Guide to Christians, when opposing the Superiour; nor a few, opposing a much major part, §. 20.

II. **H**ence, therefore (and perhaps moved by these, and such like, ill Consequences) other Reformed Divines there are, who allow not a conditional, but absolute, Promise, to be made to the Clergy, *some or other*, in a *greater*, or in a *smaller* number, in all times: Nay, yet further; made also to some visible distinct Body; and Society, or external Communion, of them, together with the Congregation of faithfull adhering to them; so that all the Clergy shall never, in no Age, universally apostatize; but *some* of them still remain Orthodox, or also *some body* of them; and there shall always be a visible Orthodox Church, or Churches, such as hath a right publick profession of Christianity, and a true Ministry of the Word and Sacraments in it: so that, according to these Divines, the fore-mentioned Promises || are advanced somewhat higher. * That Promise, *Mat. 28.* now signifying, That *Christ will be with some or other of his Clergy, in some place or other, for ever, so, as that they shall certainly teach what he hath commanded them.* And, * that *John 14.* That *they shall so love him, and keep his Commandments, as that his Spirit shall abide with them for ever, and leade them into all Truth* [Necessary]. And * that *Luke 10.* --- That they shall so faithfully recite the Truths, he committed to them, as that those who hear them, hear him.

§. 15.

|| §. 12.

Of this Church and Clergy so assisted, thus Dr. Ferne, || — It cannot be imagined (saith he), that God, who promised to be with them, and guide them, should take away his Truth from all the Guides and Pastors of his Church, and preserve it by the judgment and Conscience of Lay-people: but that some Guides and Pastors, (though of less number and place) still be they, that shall detect prevailing Errors, and preserve the Truth.

§. 16.

|| Division of England and Rome.

To

§. 17. To the same purpose is that Testimony of Mr. Ho. ker, || --- That
 || 3. l. p. 124. Gods Clergy are a state, which have been, and will be, as long as there
 is a Church upon Earth, necessary, by the plain Word of God Himself;
 A State, wherein to the rest of Gods people must be subject, as touching
 things that appertain to their Souls health. For where Policy is, it
 cannot but approve some to be leaders of others, and some to be led by o-
 thers. [This Clergy, then, to have, thus, a perpetual Being,
 must never err in Fundamentals; and therefore it will be irrati-
 onal to deny them, in these, to be a perpetual, secure, and un-
 erring Guide.]

§. 18. To the same purpose speaks Arch-Bishop Lawd, || — There
 || §. 37. P. 318 must be (saith he) some one Church or other continually visible. —
 For if this be not so, then there may be a time, in which there shall not
 any where be a visible Profession of the Name of Christ, which is contra-
 ry to the whole scope and profession of the Gospel. — And this (saith
 he) such a visible Church, as hath in all Ages taught the unchanged
 || Numb. 3. 5. Faith of Christ, in all Points fundamental ||.

|| 1. l. 10. c. And thus Dr. Field also || affirms; That the Church is always
 || P. 14, 15. visible in respect of the Order of Ministry; and due obedience yielded
 thereunto; and they discernable, that do communicate therein. and be-
 low — That always an open, known, and constant Profession of sa-
 ving Truth is preserved and found among Men, and the Mini-
 stry of Salvation continued and known in the World: for how
 || See 2. l. 6. c. (saith he) should there be a Church gathered without a Ministry ||.
 Again, thus he concerning the present Catholick Church in any one
 age, Ibid. l. 4. c. 25. — As we hold it impossible the Church should
 ever by Apostasy and mis-belief wholly depart from God (in proving
 whereof Bellarmine confesseth his Fellows have taken much needles
 pains, seeing no man of our Profession thinketh any such thing :) [Bel-
 larmines words are, Notandum multos ex nostris tempus iterere, dum
 probant absolute Ecclesiam non posse deficere; Nam Calvinus & ceteri
 Hæretici id concedunt; sed dicunt, intelligi debere de Ecclesia invi-
 sibili]: So we hold, that it never falleth into any Heresie; so that he
 is as much to be blamed for idle and needles busying himself in proving,
 that the visible Church never falleth into Heresie, which we most wil-
 lingly grant. [Bellarmines words are, Probare igitur volumus Ec-
 clesiam visibilem non posse deficere; & nomine Ecclesia non intelligimus
 unum aut alterum hominem Christianum, sed multitudinem congrega-
 tam, in qua sunt Prelati & subditi; urging also afterward out of
 Eph. 4. 11. the Ministries of Pastors, Doctors, &c, never to fail in
 the Church.] Quæ ministeria (saith he) non possunt exerceri, nisi se
 Pastores & Oves agnoscant: from all which I collect, that it must
 be of such a visible Church-government consisting of Prelates and
 Subjects

Subjects that Dr. Field allures (*Ibid.*) — That in things, necessary to be known and believed expressly and distinctly, It can never be ignorant, much less erre; nor never fall into any Heresie]. As also afterward (c. 4.) in all ages he acknowledgeth a Church, that not as a Chest preserves only the truth, but as a pillar by publick profession (notwithstanding all forces endeavouring to shake it) publisheth it to the world, and stayeth the weaknes of others, &c. Lastly in the Preface to his whole Book of the Church, he discourseth on this manner. — Seeing the Controversies of Religion, in our times, are grown in number so many, and in matter so intricate, that few have time and leisure, fewer strength of understanding to examine them, what remaineth for men desirous of satisfaction in things of such consequence, but diligently to search out which, amongst all the Societies of the World, is that blessed Company of Holy ones, that Household of Faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, that so he may embrace her Communion, follow her Directions, and rest in her Judgment. Thus he.

And thus far went Mr. Calvin long ago; holding, that there is a visible Society, consisting of Clergy and Laity, which is the only Church-Catholick; the Pillar and Ground of Truth; and the visible external Communion thereof to be continued in. See his *Instit.* 4. l. 1. c. 2. §. upon the Article [*Credo sanctam Catholicam Ecclesiam*] — *Ecclesia* (saith he) *ideo Catholica dicitur, seu universalis; quia non duas, aut tres invenire liceat, quin discerpatur Christus, quod fieri non potest* — 4. §. — *In Symbolo, ubi profitemur nos credere Ecclesiam, id non solum ad visibilem, de qua nunc agimus, refertur, sed ad omnes quoque electos Dei* [therefore this Article relateth to a Church visible, and visible in all Ages] — *Quia nunc de visibili Ecclesia differere propositum est, discamus vel uno Matris* [that it is termed a Mother] *Elogio, quam utilis sit nobis ejus cognitio, immo necessaria: quando non alius est in vitam ingressus, nisi nos ipsa concipiat in utero, nisi pariat, &c. Adde quod extra ejus gremium nulla speranda est peccatorum remissio, &c.* [such a visible Mother-Church then it seems there is in all Ages; somewhere or other, as that none can enter into life, that are not numbred among her children, and enclosed within her bosom] — 7. §. — *Quemadmodum ergo nobis invisibilem solius Dei oculis conspicuam* — *Ecclesiam credere necesse est; ita hanc, que respectu hominum, Ecclesia dicitur, observare, ejusque communionem colere jubemur* [i.e. Communionem externam, visibilem, Ecclesia visibilis] — 10. §. — *Cujus auctoritatem spernere, vel castigationes ludere, nemini impune licet; & multo minus ejus abruptum unitatem* [auctoritatem, castigationes; he must mean of the

§. 19.

the Clergy, and the spiritual Governours, thereof] — *Sic enim* [Dominus] *ejus auctoritatem commendat, ut dum illa violatur, suam ipsius immunitatem censeat. Neque enim parvi momenti est, quod vocatur columna, & firmamentum, veritatis, & domus Dei. Quibus verbis significat Paulus, ne intercideret Veritas Dei in mundo, Ecclesiam [visibilem] esse fidam ejus custodem [and that in all Ages, esse intercideret veritas]; quia ejus ministerio, & opera voluit Deus puram verbi sui predicationem conservari. — Unde sequitur discessionem ab Ecclesia Dei, & Christi abnegationem esse, — 8. §. — Proinde, quatenus eam agnoscere nostra intererat, Dominus certis notis, & quasi Symbolis nobis designavit — 10. §. — Symbola Ecclesia dignoscenda, verbi predicationem [sinceram,] Sacramentorumque observationem [ex Christi Instituo. See §. 9.] posuimus — 11. §. — Ne sub Ecclesia titulo impostura nobis fiat, ad illam probationem, seu ad Lydium lapidem, exigenda est omnis Congregatio, qua Ecclesia nomen obtendit — 2. 1. 4. §. — Minime permovere nos debet, inanis his fulgor [Romanensium], ut Ecclesiam esse recipiamus, ubi verbum Dei non apparet. — 7. §. — Quis ausit cum ceterum, nulla cum exceptione, Ecclesiam appellare, ubi verbum Domini palam, & impune conculcatur? &c. Thus Calvin, in this place, (but how constant elsewhere to this doctrine, I say not) of the authority of, and the obedience due to, a permanent visible Church, which is *Columna, & Firmamentum veritatis*, and which is Governed by Christs Orthodox Ministers of the Word and Sacraments: which Church he affirmeth to be the *Reformed*, and not the *Roman*. Concerning the Church then, *Which is It*, he, and the Roman Catholicks differ; but differ not in the Obedience due to the Church; if he may name it. Lastly, were Protestants in this matter altogether silent, yet those essential Notes or Marks they give of the true Church, *The true preaching of Gods Word, and right Administration of the Sacraments*, always to be found in it, do infer a Clergy, (to whom only both these Offices do belong), as well as a people, always Orthodox. Here observe (for which I have cited Authours the more fully) how far the Evidence of Truth hath forced them to give a Testimony in General to *Authority of the Church*; of a visible Church, consisting of a well-ordered Clergy governing, and People subject to them, of a Church enjoying a right Administration of the Word and Sacraments, free from all *Heresie* and not erring in *Necessaries*; retaining an external Communion distinct from Hereticks; out of which Communion none safe. To give directions for the finding out of which company of *Holy Ones* (always extant somewhere or other), amongst the many Societies that are in the world,*

Dr. Field

Dr. Field saith he writ his Book *Of the Church*.

But yet, after all this Flourish, when we proceed to the Discovery, *where or which*, is this *Holy, Mother, Church* (of which such noble properties are related by all sides, that it were too much temerity to doubt of them), that so we may pay our duty to her, and secure our selves within her lap, Here *these Divines* leave us much what in the same uncertainties, as the others before. For, so long as these Divines do still, together with the former, deny the Promise of such a perpetual divine assistance to Superiour persons, or Synods of the Clergy in respect of Inferiours, or to a Major part of a Synod in respect of a lesser, that holdeth or teacheth contrary; (which Superiours, and major part only, in such cases, must be the Christians Guide; a thing warranted by as universal a Tradition and Practice, as any Fundamental whatever of Church-Government ||); and whilst they do affirm this assistance continued §. 20.
only to *some* Body of Clergy or *other* always, but how inconsiderable this party for number, or dignity, in respect of the rest, they know, nor matter, not; In saying this, they in effect say no more (as to a Guide) than the former; who affirm no certain assistance of any Clergy. For, this Body of Clergy, which they affirm unailing in necessaries, is, in such a case when a *minor*, or inferiour part, but only *private persons*, not *Guides* to others, no not to their own Flocks: since no Flock (according to the *Traditive Constitution* of Church-Government) is to hear their own private Pastors, teaching contrary to the definitions of Superiour Prelats, or Councils; or in a Council, a lesser part voting contrary to a major; not to hear an *Arrian* Bishop teaching contrary to the Council of *Nice*; nor the Patriarch *Nestorius* and *Dioscorus*, and their Adherents, voting contrary to the Council of *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, as is further evidenced (in the second Discourse §. 23. &c.) || See 2. Disc. §. 23, &c. And therefore, if the *Promises* of assistance are interpreted in this their manner, the people, in following the Superiour, and the Major, part, (the *Traditive* Rule of Obedience that hath been always observed in the Church) sometimes will thus, be tied to obey only those of the Clergy, to whom Christ denies such assistance, and to disobey those, who have it.

Neither matters it much (as to constitute them a Guide any more for this) though this supposed Orthodox Clergy, in whom our Saviours *promise* is said to be preserved, be all too of *one distinct Communion*, and *one particular Church*, or *Nation*; and these too the whole Clergy of that Church. Because, since the whole Church, through the whole world, is but one *Body* governed by *one Law* of Christ; none hath, against the whole, any more reason to adhere to

his own particular Church, (when separating) as to a *Guide*, because *his own*, than to any other; unless he hath some greater assurance of its non-erring, than of any others; and besides; what reason in this kinde such a one hath to take that particular Church wherein he lives for his Guide, the same have all other Christians, living elsewhere, to refuse it for theirs; and to adhere (as he) to their own particular Church: and thus, if he, by such obedience light on truth, they by the same obedience will be necessitated to Errour. Again, if (suppose) twenty six Bishops of *several Nations*, opposing an Oecumenical Council, cannot be a Guide to all Christians, much less can they, if all these happen to be of one *Church*, or *Nation*; because here is more dependence one on another; and so a just fear of less integrity. Lastly, if *these*, against the *whole*, can have any authority; the proceedings of General Councils in condemning, and exercising Ecclesiastical censures against them as subjects to those Courts, have been unjust; (which yet those General Councils, universally allowed, have used, not only against *Bishops*, but *Patriarchs*, and the *Clergy* joyned with them); And the Church's Decrees, thus, will never be necessarily obligatory, but when the Governours thereof are all (to a *man*, or to every particular *Church*, or Society of Church-men) of one minde. Neither can the people (when the Ecclesiastical Court, (which consists of many Judges) is any way divided, tell, which to obey, if our Saviours Promise be only to *some certain* Guides, we know not in how small a number; because they know not, whether our Saviours *promise* of Indefeasibility even in necessities belongs not to the more inconsiderable part thereof. He that appoints us to follow a Guide in what it shall enjoin us; and then leaves us no way (when our Guide consists not of one, but many, persons, and particular Churches; and when two parties of them contradict one another, and guide us contrary ways) to know, which of them is to be our Guide; it is all one, as if he left us no Guide: and he that ties us, besides our own judgment, in doubtful matters, to obey, and follow, only some Ecclesiastical Society or other, not obliging us to the most, or major part, to the Superiour rather than an Inferiour person or Court, revolves our obedience, in any division of our Governours, only to our own judgment; (*i.e.*) to choose that side which we judge is most conformable to Scripture; as we follow the counsel of that Friend who we think speaks most *reason*: (But can this be called any obedience to his *Authority*?) And then, left to this choice, what opinion can we take up so absurd, as in it we cannot finde some or other Confederacy of *Clergy* for our *Leaders*?

But

But, contrary to these men, If a Clergy there shall always be (as themselves maintain), that shall not err; Then from this it seems most rationally deduced again; * That a *General Council* especially, assembled of all the chief Prelates of this Clergy, (or, if such cannot be, then at least the *most* general, that the times permit), Or, * That the whole Clergy, or, where some dissent, the much greater part thereof, manifesting by any other way (than by assembling) their concurrence in one and the same doctrine (which thing is equivalent to the Act of a General Council) shall not err. For it is more likely, that a particular person should err so, than a Synod; and a smaller Synod, than a more General; and so too, of persons subordinate; that those elected, and advanced to higher place of Judicature, should be both persons of greater knowledge and merit; and, according to the necessity of their place, *divinely* more assisted; else, why such a subordination, and appeal from lower to higher Courts; unless these be of the two the lesse liable to Errour, both from humane and divine help, where people can ascend to no further Director?

Therefore was such a subordination instituted by God under the Law, *Deut. 17. 8.*—And the *Urim* and *Thummin* at first, as an infallible Director was committed to the *High-Priest* alone, not to the rest; and, after *Urim* taken away, yet an assistance still that Person seems to have had more than the rest, according as necessity required. See *Deut. 17. 12.* & *Joh. 11. 31.* where he saith,—that *Caiphas* being *High-Priest* that year prophesied in the Council, that *Jesus* should die, &c.

Again, therefore was such a Practice, upon the first difference, repaired to by the Apostles (rather for an Example to Posterity, than for any absolute necessity thereof) *Act. 15.* And the Name of the *Holy Ghost* ||, used in that Sovereign Court, the more to authorize their Decrees. Therefore also our Saviour (*Mat. 18.*) appoints such a Gradation in conventing the offender, first before two or three, and then, before the *whole Church*; and, here, promisseth his more special Presence in an Assembly of Church-men, though it be but of a few ||. And so *S. Paul* (*1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11. 24.*) among those Governours, that Christ had appointed for guiding the people for ever in the same steady doctrine, makes a subordination, ranking *Pastors* and *Doctors* in the lowest place, and in the highest, *Apostles*: in whose place (we may presume, furnished with all necessary infallibility) succeed *Bishops*: *Bishops*, at least in their conjoint Body, and supreme Consults.

§. 21. n. 2.

|| Act. 15. 28.

|| Mat. 18. 19, 20.

|| §. 14.

1 Cor. II.
v. 19.

Here then; in a *General Council* or in such a *joint Consent* of Clergy, as is equivalent to it, the Church most justly stateth and p'aceth that *not failing* in necessary Truth, which, it seems, must be allowed (and that absolute) in some Clergy || for ever: God indeed could have infallibly assisted every particular person of the Clergy, as he did also the twelve Apostles; as also he, who then foresaw all the *modern Controversies*, could have set down as clear a decision, and much clearer, of them in the Apostles Writings, then is had in the council of *Trent*: yet to his eternal Wisdom it seemed good otherwise; as he permitted *evil* in the World, the more powerfully to bring *good* out of it, and to try, and more highly reward those who adhere to virtue, so to permit *Error* and *Heresies* in the world (*Oportet esse Hæreses*, saith the Apostle ||) to gain a nobler triumph afterward to the *Truth*, through the opposition of *Error*; and to try, and more highly reward those, who, not without some contrary verisimilities, do follow it.

Mean-while, this seems sufficient, in all Oppositions, for securing all necessary Truths, and preserving his Church indefectible therein, if the *supremest Body* in the Clergy shall not fail in their Determinations thereof; nor any other *Synods* or *Persons* fail therein, so long as they adhere to the doctrine of these *Supreme*; which if any of the inferiour Guides do not, the Church, upon any discovery, is very vigilant to suspend, or cut them off from her Body.

And here you may observe by the-way, that the *Subjects* of the *Catholick Church*, in their obedience also of their *particular Pastors*, though these Pastors be not free from Error even in Necessaries, yet have much more security of not being misled by them, than other *Sects*, by theirs; inasmuch as these *Pastors*, whose judgment the people depend on, and follow, do also generally hold, and maintain themselves obliged to follow, and obey, the judgment of these *Supreme Guides*, whom they firmly believe assisted in all Necessaries by Christ: whilst this is such a submission, as the *Leaders* of *Sectaries* renounce and protest against. As for the many difficulties and *Objections* made by Protestants against this *Guide* thus owned by the Roman Church (which *Guide* once admitted overthroweth their *Reformation*); that I may not here disturb the method I have proposed to my self, I must defer the solution of them till the end of the third Discourse: Where (Chap. 9.) I shall pass by none of any note, unconsidered, and reply'd—to.

This, for those Protestant-Divines, who allow an absolute Promise of Indefectibility (as to Necessaries) made to, and always verified in, *some Persons*, or also *some Body*, and Society, or other, of the Clergy, i.e. of the Church-Guides; but not to these always in such

such a capacity, as they are, in the Church's constitutions and traditions, declared our Guides; these Orthodox-Guides (as they suppose) being perhaps in some Ages, a very small number, nor those of the highest rank, in comparison of the rest.

CHAP. IV.

That Councils (wherein are some Dissenters) if accepted by a much Major part of the Church diffusive, do conclude the whole, and oblige Obedience.

III. *Other Expressions of Protestant-Divines, granting the Church's Prelacy as defining her Doctrines, Or the General Councils of them, to be unerrable in Necessaries, when accepted by the Church Universal. §. 22.*

Where, concerning what Judgment of the Church sufficiently obligeth her subjects, in respect, 1st, of the Church-Catholick diffusive §. 28. 2^{ly}, of Councils General §. 30. 3^{ly}, of Councils Occidental §. 35. and particularly, that of Trent §. 36.

And, concerning what acceptation of Councils by the Church-diffusive is only necessary, §. 38.

III. **B**ut thirdly, several other Expressions may be found in some of them, wherein they would seem to go further yet, and to allow; That the Church-Catholick taken in her greatest Body of Clergy, & as she is a Canonical Guide, in her General Councils, and there teacheth and defineth doctrines, can never err in Necessaries, or Fundamentals, this being understood with some certain Limitations of theirs annexed. But here, whether all their expressions cohere one with another; or, whether their opinions when strongly assaulted, will not retreat and resolve it self into the first, or second, already explained, I conclude nothing.

For this, see; first, that of D. Rotter, §. 2. p. 28. Where he saith, — *The Church-Catholick is confessed in some sense [(i.e.) in Fundamentals, as he explaineth it afterward, §. 5. p. 148. &c.] to be unerring: and he is little better than a Pagan that despiseth her judgment. For she follows her Guides, the Prophets and Apostles: and is not very free and forward in her Definitions. [Here we hear of Definitions, and Judgment of the Church-Catholick that are to be followed; Therefore (I infer) that such judgment may be known.]* So §. 4. p. 97. — *The Catholick Church (saith he) is careful to ground all her*

§. 22.

§. 23.

Expressions
of D. Potter

Decla...

Declarations, in matters of Faith, upon the Divine Authority of Gods written Word; & therefore whosoever wilfully opposeth a judgment so well grounded is justly esteemed an Heretick, [then he adds]—*not properly, because he disobeys the Church; but because he yields not to Scripture sufficiently propounded, or cleared unto him.* [Where I do not see, but that whofo believeth this in general, (as all ought), that the Church Catholick alwaies groundeth her Declarations, in matters of Faith, on Divine Authority, though every particular Declaration of hers is not cleared to him, that it is so well grounded, yet must needs from such general belief, in any differing from her, wilfully, & self-convicted, oppose her judgment, and so incur *Hereſie*; But, however he is, or is not, an Heretick, who dissent from such Declarations; yet, by the Doctor, all those persons, it seems, are secured, as for any necessary Truth, that do obey and adhere to them.] And (§. p. 169.) — *If in any thing (saith he) General Councils err and mistake; the Universal Church hath means of remedy, either by antiquating those Errours with a general and tacit consent, [General Consent: therefore any such Decree of a General Council, to render it non-obligatory, must be, at least tacitly, reversed by a major part of the Church-Catholick; else, if any single Church's reversion serves the turn to annull the Obligation thereof, no Churches are obliged to such Decrees or Declarations further than they please.] He goes on.—Or by representing her self again in another General Council, which may view, & correct the defects of the former.* [Here are two ways of the Church Catholick's correcting the Errours of her Representative, the Council. ¹. Either by, generally, not observing, or practising their Decrees. ². Or by condemning them by another Representative: therefore I gather, where the Church-Catholick neither by another general Council contradicts such assembly; nor, in her most general practice, or Doctrines, varies from its Decrees; the Declarations and judgment of such a General Council are admitted as the Declarations and judgment of the Church-Catholick: Or else, there is no way of knowing *what*; or *which*. are so.]

Ib. After that (p. 141.) he hath spoken of the present Church-Catholick, *her being as a Candlestick to present, and hold out the light to us*; and (p. 143.) of her being a witness, and an Instrument for working Faith in us; he (p. 148, 149, 156.) accords, as he saith, with some moderate Roman Writers, *That the Extent of the Infallibility of this Church [i. e. in defining, p. 156.] reacheth to all matters Essential and fundamental, simply necessary for the Church to know and believe. But, not so to all her Doctrines, and Definitions.* — And, p. 155. *The Universal Church (saith he) hath not the like* assu-

assurance from Christ, that she shall not erre in unnecessary additions, as she hath for her not erring in taking away from the Faith what is fundamental, and necessary: [Where, Defining, Adding, Taking away, &c. argue, that he speaks here of the present Church-Catholick, (which he affirms to be infallible in Fundamentals), in relation to the main Body of her Governour's being so.]

Bishop Bramhall || speaks much what on the same manner—If §. 24.
(saith he) of two particular Churches, the one retain a communion Of Bishop
Bramhall.
|| Vindic. 3. c.
p. 9. with the Universal Church, and be ready to submit to the Determinations thereof; [it must be, doth actually submit to those past, when known] the other renounces the communion of the Universal Church, and contumaciously despise the Jurisdiction and Decrees thereof, the former continues Catholick, and the latter becomes Schismatical; Or as he expresseth it, in *Schism guarded*, p. 2. That Church which shall not outwardly acquiesce, after a Legal Determination, and cease to disturb the Christian Unity, though her Judgment may be sound, yet her practice is schismatical.—And afterward.—We are most ready in all our differences to stand to the Judgment of the truly Catholick Church, and its lawful Representative, a free General Council.

[Here the Bishop's submitting and standing to the judgment, and determinations of the Church-Universal, or a free General Council, were it now called, argues him to hold the present Church-Catholick, in such Councils, as a Guide, and Law-giver, infallible in Fundamentals; or at least whose judgment in all points is finally to be stood to so far, as not to contradict it; and his pronouncing *Schismaticks* to be no *Catholicks*, argues, that this Church Universal may be also narrower, than Christianity is] Add to this, what he saith below, p. 26. —That, by disbelieving any Fundamental Article, or necessary part of saving Faith, in that sense, in which it was evermore received, and believed by the Universal Church, a man renders himself guilty of Heresie. [Here he declares one an Heretick not only in his disbelieving a necessary point of Faith, but in disbelieving it in that sense, wherein the Church-Catholick hath always believed it: which sense (in the former quotation) he holds, is to be received, and learned from her Councils.]

Again; In his Reply to the Bishop of Chulcedon, speaking of the Catholick Church in present Being, he saith, ||.—I do from my heart submit to all things which the true Catholick Church diffused over the world hath believed and practise.—And afterward—Though I have no reason in the world to suspect my present judgment, I do further profess my readines to submit to the right Catholick Church, [in present being] whensoever God shall be pleased to reveal it to me. and *Ibid.* in the Preface.—I submit (saith he) my self, and my poor endeavours,

deavours, first to the judgment of the Catholick, Oecumenical, Essential Church.—And if I should mistake the right Catholick Church out of humane frailty, or ignorance (which for my part I have no reason to suspect, yet it is not impossible, &c.) [therefore Catholick doth not necessarily include all Sects professing Christianity] I do implicitly, and in the preparation of my minde, submit my self to the true Catholick Church; the Spouse of Christ; the Mother of the Saints; the Pillar of Truth.—And after this, he professeth—That his adherence is firmer to the infallible Rule of Faith, (the holy Scriptures) interpreted by this Catholick Church [i.e. firmer to its interpretation] than to his own private judgment.—So in his Reply to S.W. p. 43.—We acknowledge (saith he) the Representative Church, that is, a General Council, and the Essential Church, that is, the multitude, or multitudes of Believers, either of all Ages, which make the Symbolicall Church; or of this Age, which makes the present Catholick Church.—And *Ib.*—We are ready to believe, and practise, whatsoever the Catholick Church even of this present Age, doth universally believe, and practise. [Surely, from these Protestations it follows; * that he supposeth that such a Church there is in this present Age, that may deliver her judgment; Else his promise to believe, and to submit to it, is utterly insignificant; and, * that he holds this Church not errable in Fundamentals, else her judgment in them could not by him be safely followed.

|| See Schisme guarded, p. 398.

§. 25.

|| p. 279.

And if you would know also, what present Body he understandeth by this present Catholick Church, to which he will yield his submission and belief, he tells the Bishop of Chalcedon || That it is not the Church of Rome alone with all its Dependents; but the Church of the whole world, Roman, Grecian, Armenian, Abyssine, Russian, Protestant; which Churches [i.e. Grecian, &c.] are three times greater than the Roman is. But, if you think the present Church-Catholick, in this vast amplitude, a Judge not likely to resolve his doubts; He, in the Preface to his Reply to the Bishop of Chalcedon, very conscientiously adds also—I submit my self to the Representative Church, a free General Council, or so general, as can be procured; And in pursuance of the same Notion of General, (Schisme Guarded, p. 50.) he saith,—That the presence of the five Proto-Patriarchs, and their Clergy, either in their persons, or by their Suffrages, or, in case of necessity, the greater part of them do make a General Council. And—That we may well hope, that God who hath promised, that where two or three are gathered together in his Name, there will he be in the midst of them, will vouchsafe to give his assistance, and his blessing to such a Council, which is as general as may be; although perhaps it be not so exactly general, as hath been

been; or might have been now, if the Christian Empire had flourished still, as it did anciently. In summe, That he shall ever be ready to acquiesce in the Determination of a Council so General as is possible to be had; so it may be equal, &c. Naming several conditions thereof;—*Equal Votes of Christian Nations*—*Absents sending their Suffrages*,—*The place free, whither all parties may have secure access, and liberty to propose freely, and define freely.* yet consenting ||—That none declared Hereticks by former true General Councils be admitted to any vote in them; and || that all those be held || p. 352
for excluded from the communion of the Catholick Church, whom undoubted General Councils have excluded. He addes yet further, reflecting on Dr. Hammond's words ||—That Oecumenical, or General Councils are now morally impossible to be had; The Christian world being under so many Empires [and some of them enemies to the Christian Religion] and divided into so many Communions, that it is not visible to the eye of man, how they should be regularly assembled.* I say, here he addes ||,—That because it is not credible, that the Turk will send his Subjects, that is, four of the Proto-Patriarchs with their Clergy to a General Council, or allow them to meet openly with the rest of Christendom in a General Council, it being a thing so much against his own Interest; that therefore, if these Patriarchs do deliver the Sense and Suffrages of their Churches by Letters, or by Messengers, this is enough to make a Council General. And —That, as there have been General Oriental Councils without the personal presence of a Western Bishop; so there may be an Occidental Council [I add General] without the Personal Presence of one Eastern Bishop, by the sole communication of their Sense, and their Faith.

And, for the calling also of this General Council, he saith ||, That if the Pope have any right, either to convocate General Councils himself, or to represent to Christian Sovereigns the fit Seasons for Convocation of them, either in respect of his beginning of unity, or of his Proto-Patriarchate, he doth not envy it him, since there may be a good use of it, in respect of the division of the Empire; so good caution be observed. And before, p. 91. he saith,—That at present he will not dispute, whether the Bishop of Rome by his reputed Primacy of Order, or beginning of Unity, may lawfully call an Oecumenical, or Occidental Council by power purely spiritual, which consists rather in advice, than in mandates properly so called; or in mandates of courtesie, nor coactive in the exterior Court of the Church: that, considering the division, and subdivision of the ancient Empire; and the present distraction of Christendom, it seemeth not altogether inconvenient. That the Primitive Fathers did assemble

E

Synods,

§. 26.
|| Ib. P. 356

|| Answ. to
Cath. Gentl.
c. 3. §. 1.

|| Schisme
guarded p.
352.

Synods, and make Canons, before there were any Christian Emperors; but that was by authority meerly spiritual; they had no coercive power to compel any man against his will; and the utmost they could do, was to separate him [I suppose, he meaneth who contemned their summons, or their Canons] from their communion, and to leave him to the coming or judgement, of Christ.

Ib. p. 120. He seems to allow to the Church-Governours a right to summon Councils, where there are no Christian Sovereigns to do it, [i.e. that will do it] and to make Canons, such as the Primitive Bishops made, before there were Christian Emperours. [Only I hope he will, consequently, allow further (what was done also by these Church-Governours in the Primitive times); that, if Ecclesiastical Governours have authority, as need requires, to summon such a Meeting, they may appoint some place for it; which place will always be in some Princes temporal Dominions; and that, if they may make Canons, they may divulge, and send abroad such their Laws, & Canons to the Church's Subjects, upon spiritual censures inflicted on the disobedient; which must be also amongst some temporal Prince his Subjects; for so did the Governors of the first Council || appoint the place of their Meeting, *Hierusalem*; and sent abroad their Canons amongst the Emperors Subjects; both, contrary to the then secular powers; and this they did without intrenching on any ones Politick Rights.]

¶ A.C. 15.

§. 27.

¶ Reply to
Chalcedon
prefat.

The Bishop having condescended to thus much concerning General Councils; he yields further ||; *That, until such Council [the most general that is procurable] he submits himself to the Church of England, wherein he was baptized, or to a National English Synod.* But here he makes too great a leap, (though perhaps he had some reason for it) in removing his Submission immediately from a General, to a National Synod of his own Church; for between these lies a Patriarchal, or Occidental Synod, to which he ought to submit; the just authority also of which, above a National Synod, he both elsewhere freely maintaineth ||; and, though nowhere, yet elsewhere, refers also his trial to it. — *There is nothing* (saith he, *Schism Guarded*, p. 136.) *that we long after more, than a General Council rightly called, rightly proceeding; or, in defect of that, a free Occidental Council, as General as may be. But then, we would have the Bishops to renounce that Oath [to the Pope] that hath been obruded upon them.* Lastly, concerning the quality of Obedience due to such Councils, even in non-fundamentals, he saith ||, — *That, as to Questions non-fundamentals, when these are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgment, are obliged*

¶ Vindic. of
the Church
of England.
p. 258.

¶ Vindic. of
the Church of
Engl. p. 27.

to passive Obedience, to possess their souls in patience. And they who shall oppose the Authority, and disturb the Peace of the Church, deserve to be punished as Hereticks; where also he makes this the fourth way of rendering ones self guilty of Heretical pravity, I suppose, because, though the Councils Determination, in his opinion, makes no point Heretic, yet at least it equals the crime of the Opposer to that of an Heretick.

I have been somewhat copious in giving you the concessions of this Bishop, not to make advantage of what a single Authority indulgeth, but because they seem no greater than reason requireth; and what other of the more moderate Protestants usually say, and all, who allow an united and regular Government of an one only visible Catholick Church ought to stand to; and therefore I desire your leave, before I proceed to some other quotations out of Protestants, to reflect a little on this submission of the Bishop's, and to see how far it, truly performed, will rationally carry him, or others, towards a present settlement in many of the points controverted.

1st. Then; This I presume here ought to be granted me, that, in the Bishop's, or other's, professing a submission to the General, or Unanimous, accord of the Church-Catholick in any Doctrine, or Practice, this accord ought not to be taken so strictly, either for what is defined by Councils, or accepted by the Church diffusively, as that, if any particular Person, Church, or Party, (perhaps his own), that is held Catholick, dissent in any thing from all the rest, being a much major part in respect thereof, and joyned also with the supreme Pastor of the Catholick Church, and Primate of the Patriarchs, he shall account himself discharged from Obedience, or deny such a Consent to be sufficiently General and Unanimous to oblige him. The reasonableness of this presumption is declared Disc. 2. §. 25. and before §. 21.

2. This premised, let us come now in the second place to the Bishop's submissions; which are promised. 1st. To the present Church-Catholick, viz. To all things universally believed, or practised by it. 2^{ly}. To Free General. 3^{ly}. Or also five Occidental, Councils. Which review in their Order.

1st. Here he professeth || — We are ready to believe and practise whatsoever the Catholick Church of this present Age doth believe and practise.

Here, if he meaneth, the Protestants are ready to believe, and practise, whatsoever all the Catholick Church of this present Age, besides them, doth believe, and practise; and understands a Consent of this Catholick Church according to the

§. 28.

Reply.

Where.

Conc. what Judgment of the Church sufficiently, obligeth.

§. 29.

I.
In respect of the Church-Catholick diffusive.
|| Schism guarded. p. 398.

former explication thereof, which is but reasonable; Then I press these four things.

157. That you would consider (upon perusal of what is said in the third Discourse, §. 82. &c. whether, for the most of the modern Controversies, the whole Catholick Church, I mean the main body both of the *Oriental*, and *Occidental* Churches, (especially as to the Guides, and Governours thereof, who only have authority of voting, and giving Laws, in the Church's highest Consultations, and to whose Judgment Inferiours in spiritual matters ought to conform) at the coming of *Luther*, did not, and do not still, agree in their opinion and practice of many things, now opposed by Protestants, and then, by *Luther* and a few others; who sided not with, or joyned themselves to, any, though lesser, part of the then Church-Governours, Eastern, or Western; but freely acknowledged their discession *a toto mundo*. See below,

¶ *Præfat. de a-*
broganda
Missæ privata.

§ 83. [Which made *Luther* sometimes thus to utter the Objections of his Conscience, within, and of the Church, without—*Quot medicamentis* (saith he ||) *quam potentibus, & evidentissimis Scripturis meam ipsius conscientiam vix dum stabilivî, ut auderem unus contradicere Papa, & credere eum esse Antichristum; Episcopos, ejus esse Apostolos; Academiâs, esse ejus Lupanaria? Quoties mihi palpitavit tremulum cor, & reprehendens obiectæ eorum fortissimum & unicum Argumentum? Tu solus sapi? Tota errant, universi?* And elsewhere ||—*Ecclesia sic sentit, & credit; Impossibile est autem, quod Christus tot sæculis Ecclesiam suam errare sinat. Tu certe solus non sapi plus, quam tot sancti viri, & tota Ecclesia—* And—*Sanctissima Catholica Ecclesie auctoritatem amamus illasam. Ea tot sæculis sic sentit, & docuit; sic senserunt, & docuerunt omnes primitivæ Ecclesie doctores, viri sanctissimi, multo majores, & doctiores te. Quis tu es, qui ausis, ab omnibus his dissentire, & nobis diversum dogma obtrudere?* To which the summe of the

¶ In Galat. 1.
11, 12.

Answer he gives (I pray you see the place) is—*Neque mihi, neque Ecclesie, neque Patribus, neque Apostolis, neque Angelo e Cælo, credendum est, si quid contra Dei verbum dicemus.*—And—*Quisque igitur videat, ut certissimus sit de sua vocatione, & doctrina.* The summe of which is, a bare pleading of a certitude of his sense of Scripture, and that he was in the Right. As for those Answers devised since to the like objections; That of Dr. *Field* ||,—*That the Doctrines, which Luther, and the Protestants oppose, were not the generally received Doctrines of the present Catholick Church, but only of a prevalent Faction in it;* Or that of Dr *Scillingfleet* ||,—*That, if they were Doctrines generally received, yet they were not Catholick Doctrines, but generally received in the nature of an Opinion: I say,*

¶ p. 82. 880.

¶ Rat. Ac-
count, p. 368.

such

such Answers were not then thought on; or not thought true or fit to be made use of. For what ground is there, to call all those Church-Governours of the present Age that have power to vote in Councils, and steer the Church, only a *prevailing Faction* in it? Or to say those Doctrines, or Practices, which none could then oppose without incurring the Church's Censures, (for so *Luther* and others did, before the Council of *Trent*), were only generally received in the nature of an *Opinion*? □

2ly. But next; if all the points that are pretended, are not found to have been generally *believed*, or *practised* in the Church-Catholick, at *Luthers* appearance; yet if *two* or *three* of them appear to be so; to so many points according to the Bishops concession here, will the Protestants stand obliged in a conformity of their *Belief*, and *Practice*: nor can they excuse their dissent from these, because a dissent, in more than these, is untruly laid to their charge.

But 3ly, If at least what is contained in the publick *Liturgies*, and *Missals* (to which all are obliged to conform) both of the Eastern, and Western Church may be said to be of universal Belief, and Practice, Protestants, by this Profession, are bound, *herein* at least, to believe and practise with the rest: And why then, do they compose *new* Liturgies? why, absent themselves from the *old*? Is it not, that these contain something in them, to which they cannot conform?

4. Lastly, For points no way *enjoyed*, yet if such (either speculative, or practical) do appear, so far as our Examination can discover to us, not only to be tolerated, but *justified*, and *maintained* either by the whole, or a much major part of the Church-Catholick united with the prime Apostolick Chair, it seems here necessary, that no particular person, or Church, do *decretally* censure any such Points as Errors in Doctrine or Practice; or do any way oblige their Inferiours to think, or profess them to be so, which this much major part alloweth, and practiseth. If liberty to think, teach, or practise otherwise than the rest of the Church doth, according to their own Opinion in a point yet no way defined, or enjoyed, may be granted to such a minor part, yet not a liberty to define *against* the Definition or Tenent of the rest, or pronounce it an *Error* in matter of *Faith*; for this cannot be done without such minor, condemning the much major, part, joyned with the prime-Patriarch; which small part's condemning both the superiour, and much greater, if it be allowed, destroys Church-Government.

§. 30.

2. *Of Councils General.

2. After this first Submission, wherein the Bishop seems to engage the Protestant's *Belief*, and *Practise* to any thing which is generally believed, and practised by the Catholick Church diffusive, though it be not also conciliarly defined; next, we come to the Church's *Councils*, Here also he makes fair promises of submission, (I mean as to external Obedience, and non-contradiction).

¶ Schifm guarded, p. 352.

And 1st. In respect of a *Council General* he is not in every thing touching them so nice, or exceptionous, as some Protestants be.— For 1st. He exacts not, *that this Council should be so absolutely general, as that any Hereticks should be admitted*; i.e. such, as *true General Councils have evidently declared to be Hereticks*; or such, as *will not pronounce Anathema against all the old Heresies* || [I suppose he means, all which have been condemned for Heresies by undoubted General Councils]. 2^{ly}. Nor exacts he, *that all the five Proto-Patriarchs should be present there*; four of them, and their Clergy being now under the power of the Turk; but grants it *sufficient, if the sense, and Suffrages of them, and their Churches, be delivered by Messengers, or Letters*. 3. As for the calling also of this Council, *considering the division, and sub-division of the ancient Empire, and the present distraction of Christendom* [i.e. as to the altogether contrary Interests of the Princes thereof] he is well enough content, *that the prime Patriarch summon it*; and then, upon this conceded, I think I may adde, as evident from what is said before, §. 26. that the same Patriarch may both appoint some place of meeting, and also, such Council met there, may divulge, and, upon spiritual censures, require to be observed, its *Decrees* concerning matters meerly spiritual, whether, meanwhile, the secular Powers favour, or frown; I say, *appoint some place*; which place, since it must be within the Dominions, and under the Power of some particular Prince, and farther distant from some particular Churches than others, it cannot be expected that it shall ever be so fitly chosen, as equally to serve all Interests, or remedy all Inconveniences; and therefore supposing, free access, free proposal, and voting, for all Prelats that come, the *post-acceptation* must make amends for the necessity of many Prelats, or also Church's, *absence*.

§. 31.

1.

Things thus far conceded by him concerning General Councils, my Exceptions against the rest of his Discourse, are these. 1st. That in his reckoning up the Clergy of the *Roman, Grecian, Armenian, Abyssine, Russian, Protestant Churches*, as the parts constituting the entire body of such a General Council; and

and affirming, that the rest of them are a body three times greater than the *Roman*, though including the Western Churches joynd with it ||, he seems much to miscount.

For, in the first place, || See before, Several of the Protestant Churches, viz. so many as have deposed §. 25.

Bishops, and constituted a Presbyterial Government, for any thing I can see, are very clearly concluded by Dr. *Hammond*, and Dr. *Ferne* ||, to be schismaticks; and that from, and against, their *Spiritual Superiors*; which Schism excludes them from being true Members of the Church-Catholick, or having place in her General Councils, especially, since their Clergy also are no Bishops, (See Bishop *Bramhall*, *Vindic. of the Church of England*, p. 9. opposing Catholick, and Schismatical, as he doth elsewhere Catholick, and Heretical). But then, as for the *Bishops* of other Protestant Churches, neither can they escape the same imputation of Schism by the same Dr. *Hammonds* Concession, if those Councils (the *Lateran*, that of *Constance*, *Florence*, &c. mentioned below, §. 75.) whose Authority and Decrees they have rejected, be truly their *Superiors*; nor yet escape the imputation of *Heresie* in the Catholick account, or perhaps in Bishop *Bramhall's* (considering what he saith, *Vindic. of the Church of England*, p. 27. quoted before, §. 27. and *Schism guarded*, p. 352. if any of these Councils be Legally General.

|| (See their words *Disc. 2. §. 24. n. 2.*)

* 2. Next: As for several of those Eastern, and Southern Churches, that are brought in by the Bishop the more to enlarge the Church-Catholick in comparison of the *Roman-Catholick*, they are a Mass of many several Sects (of which see what is said more at large in *Disc. 3. §. 84. n. 3.*) such as, after the Council of *Chalcedon*, some sooner, some later, deserting their former Patriarch, have since ranged themselves under several Patriarchs of their own, that keep their residence in several Cities of the East; the different Sects having set up in later times, without any Conciliar Authority acting in it, no less than seven or eight Independent Patriarchs. Likewise, they stand divided both from the *Latine* and *Greek Church*, and also from one another, in several Tenents concerning our *Lords*, *Person*, *Natures*, and *Wills*; many of those, dispersed in the more Eastern parts, *Assyria*, *Mesopotamia*, &c. suspected (as Dr. *Field* || acknowledgeth) of *Nestorianism* somewhat qualified: many of the Southern, as the *Egyptians*, or *Cophites*, *Ethiopians*, or *Abyssines*, (who as to their Religion depend on *Egypt*) suspected (as the same Dr. *Field* relateth ||) of *Eurychianism*, or rather of *Dioscorism* (who was Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and condemned in the Council of *Chalcedon*);

§. 32.

2.

|| Of the Church. §. 62.

|| Ib. p. 64, 66.

cedon); divers of them also, amongst other extravagant Rites, retaining *Circumcision*. If this then be true, which this Doctor relates; though they be not perfect *Eutychians* and *Nestorians* in their Opinions, yet such they are, as do in their Tenents transgress against the Faith, and Definitions; of the third and fourth General Council; the latter of which Councils also the greatest body of these Oriental Sects expressly rejects (See Dr. Field p. 70, 71.) No reason then hath Bishop Bramhall or other Protestants to admit these to a *Suffrage* in a Catholick General Council. And if it be said ||, that moit of them, in such illiterate Regions, are only, through invincible ignorance, *material*, not *formal*, Hereticks; and therefore are not so unmercifully to be cut off from the Catholick Church, it is to be remembred, that we speak not here, of cutting off either them (or also Protestants) so many as are invincibly ignorant, from being *internally* still members of the Church, and of the Body of Christ, and possibly capable of salvation; but, of their having *externally* no right (being involved in such Tenents) to partake of the Government of the Church, or vote in its Councils; For, in expelling Hereticks from her Councils, the Church can only look to the external profession thereof; and indeed, suppose only a Material Heretick admitted to these Councils, his *ignorance* would be, as to voting, as much the bane of Truth there, as the formall Hereticks *persecution*.

|| See D. Field
4. 3. c. 5.

§. 33.

3.

But 3ly. Were they never so good Catholicks; yet their Body and bulk, (taking in the *Greek Church* also) as for those residing in the Turks dominions, is far from being so considerably great, as it is made. Where (especially for the former Prelacy that was there) the oppression is so great, these Dignities so set to sale, and their means and revenue so alienated, and most of the Metropolies in *Asia* so ruin'd, as that the bare title of many of the Ancient Sees only now descending is neglected, and the succession in them ceased: And, though the Eastern territory is much vaster, yet it may reasonably be presumed, that, abstracting those which in these parts are adherents to the Roman Communion (as the *Maronites* a long time have been), there are more Canonical Prelates, and perhaps Christians, in some small part of *Europe*, then there are throughout all *Turky*: Brerewood computing || the whole Body of Christians in *Asia* (those united with *Rome* being also included) not to amount to a twentieth part of its Inhabitants: and all the Turks Dominions here, in *Europe*, not to exceed the magnitude of *Spain* †: Throughout whose Dominions also the chief Supporters of the Christian Religion are mostly *Regulars* and

|| Brerew. Enq.
p. 24. & 28.

† Ib. p. 67.

and *Monks*, no welcome Colleagues for the Protestants to join with. The chief and most united Body of these Eastern Christians is in *Greece* ||, which *Boetius* (but long ago) conjectured might make up two thirds of the inhabitants there; And, as for those Christians more remote, divers of them, by the diligent missions of several Religious Orders of the Roman Profession out of *Europe* into those parts, (who, by the Merchants help, procure houses of constant residence there) have been from time to time reduced to the Unity of the Roman Faith and communion, as appears in the relation of these Missions. See *Spondan. Annal. A. D. 1616. 8. Brerewoods Enquir. c. 19. p. 147. --- and Dr. Field p. 63.* what hath hapned in the more Eastern Churches, (the *Affyrians*, and their Patriarchs,) since *A. D. 1550.* And as their number, small; so is learning there, by reason of extreme Poverty, very much decayed ||. So that he must now adhere to the Western, who would adhere either to the *major*, part of Christianity, or to the *learned*. And it seems a great tergiversation and distrust in their cause, for any person, or Church, of this Western-flourishing Body, to fly and retire to such remote Confederates, some of them almost our Antipodes: and to decline the judgment (that is easily had) of the same Western-Body, which hath a *Conclusive* authority, in respect of any part thereof, for controversies arising within this Patriarchate; & which was always, by reason of the Presidency of *S. Peters* chair, the most dignified part of *Christendom*; & is the most free, at this present time, in its exercise of Religion; the most unmolested in its Government & Discipline; the most flourishing in learning & Records of Antiquity; & lastly; which by its numerous Clergy, & Populacy, & the extent also of several members of its Body into all those parts, where these other Churches reside, doth seem, by much the greatest part of Christianity. But much more will it appear such, when I have added to it that great Body, of the same Communion, which now flourisheth with a Learned Prelacy, and Clergy, and daily spreads its roots further in the *West-Indies*, and, may not, I say, the *East* too? It having pleased God, singularly to honour this Grand Church, and Communion with the fulfilling of his *Promises*, in the most eminent *Propagations* of the Christian Faith amongst *Heathen Nations* until this day; she also prosecuting it with an unconquerable zeal, much different from, and prosperous beyond, all other Sects. Which thing, that all pious people have so much reason, to bless God for, (if this Communion stood guilty of such a gross Idolatry, as some of its Neighbours charge it with) would be our Heavenly Father's sending to these poor famelick people, only, *in stead of Bread, a stone; and in stead of Fish, a Serpent.*

F

4. But

|| See *Brerew. Enquir. 10. & 14. ch.*
- *Boetius Relat. Universalis del. Gr. Turco.*

|| See *Roger Recoll. Terr. Sainte. l. 2. Tract. 4. 5.*
- *Thomas à Jesu de cour. Gent. l. 6. p. 285.*

§. 34.

4.

See Disc. 3.
§. 22. Cc. 84.
n. 5. Cc.

5.

4. But 4ly, how numerous soever these Eastern Christians be, or how good their title to give their Suffrages in Councils; yet, there seems no great advantage, that can arise to the Protestant party hence; all these Churches in their publick Liturgies, Doctrins, & Rites, as to the Protestant controversies, much what agreeing with the *Greek Church* ||; and thus again with the *Roman*.

5. Lastly, this *consent and agreement* of the *Greek*, and other *Eastern Churches*, or the greatest part of them, with the *Roman* in the forenamed Controversies, appearing in their Liturgies, Writings, common Practices, and these not borrowed from the West, between which, and them, there is known to have been for many Ages no great Friendship, seems sufficient to render the Occidental Councils, wherein these Points have been decided, either *General*, or *Equivalens* thereto, without those *Letters or Messages* which the Bishop requires as necessary from these Churches; which *Letters* depend on the assembling of some inferior Synods *Diocesan*, or *Provincial*, among them; a thing, in so great a Desolation, not to be expected. Yet, before the *Turks* last Conquests, there hath been in some of these *Western Councils*, that have determined some of these points, a considerable Representative of the Eastern Churches; as in the *Great Lateran Council* under *Innocent*, and in the *Eleemine*. So, then, stands the case with the Bishop and other Protestants; that, yielding submission to General Councils, they cannot rightly, on this account, withdraw it from several Councils that have been assembled in the West in latter Ages.

§. 35.

3.

3. * Of Councils Occidental.

3. But next, this Bishop professeth himself to submit also to the Sentence of an Occidental Council, if this a *free* one; so that we need not further trouble our selves to enquire after a more General but search, if any such free Occidental Council hath defined all, or any, of the present Controversies, which Council he obligeth the Protestant Churches to acquiesce in; and that with good reason: For, the same Authority hath a *Patriarchal Council* over the *National Churches*, and Synods of the West, as these claim over *Provincial*, or *Diocesan*; Now, the authority of such *National Synods* over the several dioceses, or Provinces, see established in the Synod under King *James*, 1603. *Can.* 139, 140. And the same Authority of *Patriarchal Synods* see granted by Dr. *Field*, and others, *Disc.* 2. §. 24.

Now Occidental Councils there have been many (several of them before *Luther's* days, and one since), that have decreed and given their Sentence in several, if not all, of Points of Controversie, of which yet the Protestants do still, from a free

a free Occidental Council, seek resolution || The enquiry || See below,
 then remains concerning their freedom, where also, I suppose, §. 75.
 no greater freedom needs to be proved, than, as to the particular
 Controversies defined against Protestants; For a Council, to which
 some violence is offered in one thing, which perhaps is, by some
 potent persons therein, contended for, yet may be left altogether
 free as to many other things, wherein none of its members have
 any particular, or all have an equal, interest. 1st. Then, If
 we enquire into the Western Councils before *Luther* [that of
Frankfort; (Mistakes being removed, concerning which see
Mr. Thorndike || and *Dr. Hammonds* || Concessions); the great || Epilog. l. 3^d
Lateran Council, and those five preceding it (that defined a sub- || p. 363.
 stantial conversion in the Eucharist); the Council of *Constance*; || Of Idolatry. §. 57.
 and that of *Florence*]; I finde nothing objected against their free-
 dom, nor any considerable anti-faction then in the Church, as to
 the points we speak of, against which there was any need, to pro-
 cure in the Council another party, or to over-awe any ones liber-
 ty: Nor see I any necessity, of force to be used upon the Fathers
 for voting those things lawful, which were their daily practice;
 or for voting such a thing a truth in their Meeting (as that of a sub-
 stantial conversion in the Eucharist), which before their convening
 (though agitated much, and contradicted by some Inferiours;
 yet) not one Bishop, in the Catholick Church of those times,
 opposed. And, if the paucity of the number of Western
 Bishops in some of these Councils should be alledged as a preju-
 dice to them, the general acceptance of them by those times makes
 a sufficient amends for it.

There remains then only the consideration of the free- §. 36. n. 1.
 dom of that Occidental Council held since *Luthers* time, that of || Before
Trent according to the particulars required by the Bishop || §. 25.
 there are four Observables (which being more fully discoursed
 in the *Considerations on that Council*, shall only be briefly touched
 here), sufficient to remove our jealousy of any violence used for
 the defining most of those Points (I will not say, all, to avoid some
 evils) controverted by Protestants, concerning which Points on-
 ly is our inquiry.

The 1st is, That however some of those Points may be pre-
 tended to have been voted at first as it were *surprizingly* by a ve-
 ry small Body of Bishops; and many of those, of one Nation;
 yet both a full Body of Bishops afterwards, in the Conclusion of the
 Council, unanimously agreeing, ratified these; and the General
 Body of the absent Prelates of all the Western Churches (except

Protestants), and those of France, among the rest, accepted them: For which, See *Consid. on the Conc. of Trent*. §. 77. &c.

The 2^d, That *Soave*, no friend to this Council, yet testifies that, as to the Protestant or Lutheran controversies, the votes of the Fathers of that Council were very unanimous, without any cloak bag expected from Rome; without any dispute or contras, either between themselves, or with the Pope; (though, about some other points, there was much.) which See particulariz'd as to the several Points, in *Considerations*, §. 158. And *Soave*, p. 230. speaking of the Council's using ambiguity of expression, in some matters wherein was some diversity of opinion among the Fathers, so to satisfy all, (saith he) that which hath been related in this particular, and perhaps did happen in many matters, occurred not in condemning the Lutheran opinions; where all did agree with an exquisite Unity.

§. 36. n. 2.

The 3^d, that, without such a testimony, if any consider, that the things defined, of which here is no question, were most of them common practices, then, used by all these Prelates (before they were assembled in Trent) in their several Dioceses, and so for many hundred years formerly; and that the question in the Council chiefly to be decided for overthrowing the Protestant Opinion, was, whether such Practices lawful? viz. Whether Communion in one kind only; Adoration of Christ's corporal presence in the Eucharist; Offering the Sacrifice of the Mass; Veneration of Images; Prayer to Saints; Prayer for the dead; Indulgences; Monastick Vows; Enjoyning Celibacy; Enjoyning Sacramental Confession in case of mortal sin, &c. were lawful? which lawfulness, all those, that practised these things before, (who were the most, if not all), must also believe before, or else, practised them against Conscience: And if they believed such things lawful, there can be imagined no need of laying upon such persons to procure a Vote of this lawfulness: Nor, again, was there a necessity of any thing more, than such a Vote, for this Council to pass a Sentence of Condemnation on the Protestants contrary judgments.

§. 36. n. 3.

The 4th, That, though the Protestant Bishops, trespassing in some points of their Reformation against former free Occidental Councils (of which see below §. 75.) therefore needed not to be admitted into this Council, because having either upon the account of *Heresy*, or of *Schism*, forfeited their Right, yet, had they been received, and that not only to plead their cause, but also to decide in the Council, the small number of them (some Protestant Churches, also, having no Bishops) had been

been inconsiderable in respect of the rest; and so, the determination of things would still have gone the same way. And indeed they were admitted to plead their Cause, both by a *safe Conduct* granted; and, when they came, no violence offered; But I cannot say on the other side, that no violence was offered to the Council, and that, within three weeks after their coming, by the very Princes that sent them; who on a sudden appeared in Arms, against the Emperor ||, and by their near approach caused the dispersion of this Assembly at Trent; and the sudden return from thence of their *Divines*.

|| Soave p. 374
375.

But, had the coming of these *Divines* been serious, and their stay longer, what would they have said here, that they had not formerly written, and that the Council, in those Writings, had not perused? Or by what Arts could they have dissuaded (as they desired it ||) this Venerable Assembly from taking, for their Rule, and Guides, in the Exposition of Scriptures, the *Apostolical Traditions*; *former Councils*; and *Fathers*; by which they were cast?

|| Soave, p. 642

Further, Suppose all things had been regulated in this Council, not by *Personal Consensus*, but by the *Equal Votes* of the Western Nations; (though this is contrary to the usual manner, and never practised, save only in two late Councils after *A. D.* 1400. *Constance*, and *Basil*; and liable to many Inconveniences; of which see *Considerations on the Council of Trent*, §. 169.) yet, if these *Votes* were truly adjusted, and proportioned, according to the several *Magnitude* of the Countries, and *Multitude* of the Bishops in them, the Protestants also would by this way have been as much over-numbered, and over-born as by the other way of personal Votes, always anciently used. Which they well saw, and therefore never motioned it ||. But motioned this; That, after their party first allowed with the rest a *decisive Vote*, yet the *Decisions in the Council should not be made by plurality of votes*; but that the more sound *Opinions* should be preferred; i. e. those *Opinions* that were regulated by the Word of God; (they are Soave's words || not mine.) And motioned yet a second thing ||; — That if a *Concord in Religion* could not be concluded in the Council, then the *Conditions* of *Pavia*, and *Ausburge* might remain irrevocable. Now these *Conditions* were a *Toleration* of all Sects, that every one might follow what *Religion* pleased him best. See Soave, 378, 393.

|| Soave, p. 642

|| Ibid.
|| Soave, Ibid.

And after this, motioned a third ||; — That, the body of the whole Western Clergy being now divided into Plaintiffs [the Protestant Clergy;] and Defendants [the Catholic Clergy;] and it not being just, what *dispute* of these should be the Judge, therefore, that

|| See Soave, p. 369.

that, the Divines on one part, and on the other, arguing for their own Tenents, there might be Judges [i. e. Laicks] indifferently chosen on both sides [that is, in an equal number] to take knowledge of the Controversies. Thus these new Reformers would have New-moulded a Council. And see Dr. Stil. motioning some such thing, *Rat. Account*, p. 479. [And this indeed was the only way they had, in referring themselves to judgment, not to be cast, if the judges of their own side, at least, would be true to them.] But, to let these things pass; As to a due proportion of *National Votes*, (from which they would make shew of some advantage) this Council of *Trent* is not to be thought deficient therein; whilst those Nations, who (by their own, if by any ones, fault) had fewer Votes in the Council in passing the Decrees, yet were as plenary, and numerous as the rest, in the acceptation of them, after it. And, were now anew these things put to an equal Vote of the Western Nations, I see not from what the Protestants may reasonably expect, supposing the greatest liberty in these Votes that is possible, an issue diverse from the former: For, have they any new thing to propose, in their Orations, and Speeches, to such a Meeting, that they have not already said in their Writings? And, notwithstanding, are not the major part of the *Occidental Clergy*, and the Learned, that peruse them, of a different judgment? And why should not the others have as great presumptions, upon an equal hearing, to prevail for reducing some of the Protestant party by *Scriptures*, explicated by *Apostolical Traditions*, *Councils*, and *Fathers*; as the Protestants, of gaining some of the others by *Scriptures* alone? Or, if any will say, that ancient Tradition, Councils, or Fathers, are on the Protestant side, how comes this to be one of their Articles proposed to the Council, that, all *Humane Authority* being excluded, the Holy *Scriptures* might be judge in the Council? And, the *Trent Safe-Conduct* running thus; *Quod causa controversa secundum Sanctam Scripturam, Apostolorum Traditiones, probata Concilia, Sanctorum Patrum Auctoritates, Catholicae Ecclesiae Consensum præferuntur*. Why desired they a freer Safe-Conduct, running after the form of that of *Basil* to the *Bohemians*? † Which if it had been granted (saith *Sorve* ||) they had obtained one great point, *ih. 2. 1.* that the Controversies should be decided by the Holy Scripture. [viz. Alone, and shutting out the Ecclesiastical Interpretation of them.]

† See Confid.
on Council of
Trent. §. 104.
|| P. 344.

This, from §. 28. I have said occasionally to Bishop Bramhall's and others so frequent free offers of Submission to the judgment of the present Catholick Church; or of free (General, or also Occidental) Councils. And to shew them, that, if they will stand to their

their engagement, they must submit to those Councils that have been held already, and already have heard, and given Sentence against, their Cause.

After Bishop Bramhall, Next come we to Arch-Bishop Laud.

He (§. 37. p. 338.) affirms; — *That, the Visible Church hath in all Ages taught this unchanged Faith of Christ in all points Fundamental.*

Doctor White (saith he) had reason to say this. — And §. 21. p. 140. — *It is not possible the Catholick Church [i. e. of any one Age] should teach*

[He speaks therefore of the Governors of it in such Ages.] *against the Word of God in things absolutely necessary to Salvation.* — And (§. 25. n. 4.) — *I have speak of plain, and easie Scripture, the whole Church cannot at any time be without the knowledge of it.* — If A. C.

means no more, than that the whole universal Church of Christ cannot universally erre in any one point of Faith simply necessary to all mens Salvation, he fights against no Adversary that I know, but his own fiction. For the most learned Protestants grant it. [Where he

speaks of the Church as teaching such points, as appeareth by the Context.] *Ibid. p. 139.* — *Because the whole Church cannot uni-*

versally erre in absolutely fundamental Doctrines, therefore 'tis true also, that there can be no just cause of making a Schism from the whole Church. — *That she may err indeed in Superstitions, and Delu-*

sions, and other by and unnecessary Truths from Curiosity or other weakness: But if she can err either by falling away from the founda-

tion [i. e. by Infidelity,] or by heretical Error in it, she can be no longer holy; (for no Assemblies of hereticks can be holy) and so this

Article of the Creed [I believe the Holy Catholick Church] is gone. Now this Holiness (saith he) *Errours of a meaner alloy take*

not away from the Church. — Likewise (§. 33. n. 4. p. 356.) the same Arch-Bishop saith yet more clearly — *That suppose in the whole Ca-*

tholick Church Admittance an absolute Infallibility in the prime Funda-

ments of Faith absolutely necessary to Salvation, [for which see the former Quotations] if anything may, and wrench the General Coun-

cil [he must mean here, wrench it in non-necessaries; Or, such Council as is not universally accepted; for, a General Council,

universally accepted by the Church Catholick, is unerrable in necessities, because the Church Catholick, he saith, is so.] the whole

Church upon evidence found in express Scripture, to demonstration of this mis-marriage, that power, to represent her self in another body or

[General] Council, & to take order for what is amiss, either practised, or concluded, [in the former] — & to define against it, p. 257.) [He

must mean here a Definition no further questionable (as the former was), made by a Council universally accepted by this whole

*Church that is Infallible.] — And afterward, (p. 258.) — *This**

§. 37.
Of Arch-Bi-
shop Laud.

show, though the Mother Church, Provincial, or National, may err; yet if the Grandmother, the whole Universal Church [He means in a general Council universally accepted] cannot err in these necessary things, all remains safe; and all occasions of disobedience, taken from the possibility of the Church's erring, are quite taken away. All remains safe, i.e. by an Universally-accepted General Council controlling the other.—Again, §. 38. n. 14. he saith, That, a General Council, de post facto, after it is ended, and admitted by the whole Church, is then infallible.—And, for this admittance, or confirmation of it by the Church, he granteth ||, That, no confirmation is needful to a General Council lawfully called, and so proceeding, but only that, after it is ended, the whole Church admit it, though never so tacitly.

§. 26. p. 195.

The sum of all in brief is this; 1st. That, a General Council [or indeed any Council whatever, less than General] accepted, or admitted by the whole Church, is infallible in *Necessaries*, (the reason is plain, because he holds, the whole Church is so.) 2^{ly}. Consequently, that Obedience, and this, of *Assent*, is due to such Council, or to the judgment of the Church Catholick that is delivered by this Council, as to necessities; Of *Assent*, I say, to it, because infallible. 3^{ly}. That all are to acquiesce in, none presume to urge, or credit any pretence of, Scripture, or Demonstration against, such a judgment, because, infallible. 4^{ly}. That, it is Schism to depart from the judgment of such a Council; because the Arch-Bishop holds, all departure of any Member from the whole Church Catholick to be so ||.

§. 26. p. 139.

§. 38.

Reply.

Where.

Concerning what acceptance of Councils by the Church dissuasive is only necessary.

Now, thus much being professed by the Arch-Bishop; if he will also allow the Church, or her Councils, and not private men, to judge when their Definitions are made in matters necessary; and, 2^{ly}, will grant an acceptance of such Council by a much major part of the Church Catholick dissuasive (I mean, of those Church-Governours in it, whose judgments can be had) to be sufficient, though some lesser party continue to contradict, I think several Contraries, that are yet agitated, will appear formerly decided, and the Church's Peace not so difficult to be settled. For, in the Church Catholick, within this last thousand years, have been assembled many Councils; so General as the times permitted, and as the Callers thereof could procure; and these her Councils have made many Definitions contrary to the Protestant Doctrines; and yet she hath not hitherto, (though importuned by several pretending Demonstrators of the contrary to these Definitions, & assembled her self in any other Synod equal to the former, to recall such Councils

or

or their acts, which certainly is that tacit admission of them by the whole Church more, than which the Bishop requires not, as he saith above||. Nay, when *later* Councils have been called from time to time, yet in these she hath altered nothing concerning those Definitions made in the *former*: Nay, a much major part at least of the Church-Catholick have also, out of Councils, in their publick Writings, Doctrines, and Practices, not only not contradicted, but owned the Legality of these Councils, and the Truth of their Decrees: Now, may we not hence conclude, that the whole Church-Catholick (I mean, whose judgment we can procure) hath, in such a sense as is necessary, admitted, and accepted them? And that nothing hath been, or is, brought in, that she owns for a demonstration of the contrary to what she hath defined?

|| See before
§. 37.

And here may we not conclude, that, according to the Arch-Bishop's sense, these fore-past, and so long unquestioned, Councils are to be esteemed *infallible*? Or, if this we may not presume; what hopes have we left, of ever knowing the Church-Catholick's mind; her acceptation, or non-acceptation of any thing? or, of enjoying at all, as to *Necessaries*, this her infallible Guidance, promised us by Protestants, in stead of that of her Council's? We have waited now above 400 years, since the Conciliar determination of *Transubstantiation*: no Council equal to those, which passed it, hath been assembled by the Church-Catholick to retract it: I ask, Hath not the Church then already sufficiently accepted it, though some, in some times, have offered to her their seeming demonstrations against it?

In the expectation of *new demonstrations*; of a *new Assembly*; such as shall be called by the whole Church-Catholick, and not by the *Pope*; and of a Council more *full*, and compleat, than any former, for a Thousand years, have been; wherein the *Coptites*, *Melchites*, *Armenians*, *Abyssines*, *Russians*, &c, are to have a part; I ask, what shall poor Christians do for a Guide, that may secure them, at least in *Fundamentals*, If first, The most supreme Guides that they have, and have had, and such acceptation of their Acts, as hath been, may not be *securely* relied on; and (then,) such an infallible Guide, as is promised them instead thereof, can never be had? Unless these Divines also will here retreat, and make use of the Answer that is mentioned before, § 8. *viz.* that nothing at all, that is, or can, come into controversie, is necessary to be decided.

But, If the *past Councils* need an acceptation of the whole Catholick-Church to render them infallible, more than the acceptation that is forementioned, what must it be?

§. 39.

1.

d. §. 32. n. 5.

1st. Must it be that of another second General Council assembled by the Church approving and confirming the former? For, such thing the Arch-Bishop mentions: But, how shall we know, again, of this Council, whether the Church-Catholick sufficiently accepts it? And what if it accepts this no more amply, than the former? Or, are there any such new Evidences or Demonstrations now discoverable in matter of Faith, that are not as liable to be mistaken in one Council, as in another; in this latter, as in the former? For a Demonstration (in the Arch-Bishop's sense ||) such, as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it, is sooner to be found in Mathematicks, than Divinity. For what, or how few Theological Truths are they, that all, in their right wits, and understanding the Terms, immediately assent to, when proposed? Or what Judge, in these matters, can promise such Evidence, as that none, having the use of Reason, shall deny his Sentence? Lastly, As to one Council's accepting of another; where can we say, if we may not in the first? For, will not this second Council be rendered as uncertain to us for it's Definitions, and as liable to Appeals, upon other new Evidences, and Demonstrations pretended against it, as the former was? For when this second Council shall again, in it's Definition, against these false Demonstrations that are already examined, corroborate the sentence of the former Council; yet this hinders not, but that some other Evidences (for any thing the Arch-Bishop can assure us) may be produced afterward against it, and its Definition; that may be true.

2.

Or, 2^{ly}. Must it be such an acceptance of the whole Catholick Church out of Council; that no person, or, at least, Church, contradicts such former Council? This also is unreasonable: For some, not only Persons, but Churches, and these very considerable (I mean, in comparison of some other Churches, though not in respect of the main Body of the Catholick Profession) may stand condemned of Heresie, and Schism by some former Council; and therefore after this, do become incapable of any right now, either of Voting in, or accepting of, a future Council; I mean, in such a manner, as that their Vote, and acceptance, are any way necessary to the validity thereof. Or such Persons, or Churches, if not condemned of former Heresie, yet may be, by the much greater, and more considerable part of the present Council, for some new Doctrine of theirs, against the former traditive Faith of the Church, either suspended from sitting, and voting with them; or, if also admitted to vote, (as in a thing perhaps not so clear in former tradition), yet, when they are found, in the number

ber of Suffrages, much inferior to the rest, in this case, neither their Contrary Vote in the Council, nor their non-acceptation of it afterward, are of any effect, as to the annulling of the Acts of such Councils. Otherwise, no *new* Tenent can be condemned by the Church; if those who hold it, being a *considerable* number, will not concur, to vote, or to accept, the condemnation thereof. Some *Arrian* Bishops never accepted the Council of *Nice*; nor now the *Socinians*. Unless therefore the former acceptation of the Church-Catholick, though perhaps deficient in some persons, or also Churches, may suffice to render, or declare the judgment of that Council infallible, who can be assured, but that this *Nicen* Council erred in a point Fundamental, (if the Deity of our Saviour may be thought such)? The Church-Catholick's acknowledged Infallibility in Fundamentals, and her acceptation of Councils, may not be obstructed with such unactuable Circumstances, as that these can never, in any particular, come to be known.

This for the Arch-Bishop.

And here I think fit not to omit D. *Hammond*. Who, though (as hath been shewed already §. 5.) he denies any Certainty, any Divine Promise, That the Church as a Guide, or that her most Supreme and General Councils are Infallible, even in Fundamentals, (which would oblige their Subjects to obedience of Assent): Yet he so far maintains the Authority of these Councils (supposed Fallible) in their decision of Controversies, as that all Inferiors, Persons or Churches, Churches though National, are obliged to acquiesce to their Determinations, and not to defend against them any contrary Opinion: Which much serves to our design. To this purpose in his Treatise of Heresie §. 14 n. 6.—*We do not believe (saith he), that any General Council, truly such, ever did, or shall, erre in any matter of Faith; Nor shall we further dispute the Authority [I suppose he means, to oblige us], than we shall be duly satisfied of the Universality, of any such Council. [Now, they that believe (from Gods constant care, and providence over his Church, as he doth)] that General Councils never have or shall err in matters of Faith, must also believe as true, whatever such Councils have or shall define in matters of Faith.* Again in his Answer to Cath. Gent. c. 2. §. 3. he saith—*A Congregation, that is Fallible, may yet have Authority to make Decisions, and to require Inferiors so far to acquiesce to their Determinations, as not to disquiet the peace of that Church with their contrary Opinions: And* Ib. c. 8. §. 1. n. 7.—*I acknowledge as much, as C. G. or any man, the Authority of a General Council against the dissent of a Nati-*

§. 40.

§ See below
§. 59.

on, much more of a Particular Bishop. Thus he. Where then an Authority lawfully requires it, such an Obedience of acquiescing cannot lawfully be withheld. And hence, in D. Hammonds account, as well as the former Bishop's, all the liberty that Protestants can claim from being tied by former Councils depends, here, on their not having been truly General. Which matter having been debated but now with the two Bishops, may here be superfed.

CHAP. V.

*That the Church-Governors before the Reformation
erred not in Necessaries.*

IV. Learned Protestants conceding, the former Church's Clergy preceding the Reformation never so to have erred in defining Necessaries, as that the Church governed by them did, not remain still True, Holy, and Catholick, §. 41.

§. 41.

IV. Suitably to their Concessions, set down in the last Chapter; These Learned Protestants do not assume the confidence to pronounce; The joint Body of the Pastors, and Governors of any precedent Age of the Church, (how corrupt soever they have been in their Conciliary Definitions,) to have erred, or to have misled the people, in Necessaries, Essentials, or Fundamentals of Religion, whether in respect of Faith, or Holiness; No, notwithstanding that they have placed, in these very times, the Reign of Antichrist: Whence it may be presumed, that the Church shall not see, nor suffer, hereafter, worse times, than those past: And that all these Governours, in any succeeding Age, shall not misguide the people in Necessaries, or Fundamentals, whom, in the times of Antichrist, they have not misled so.

1. In order to all Necessary Faith Bishop Bramhall || holds the present Roman, a true part of the present Church-Catholick; and frequently affirms the Reformed, as to Essentials in Faith, not to have separated from it. And Dr. Potter speaks thus of the present Roman Church ||—The most necessary, and Fundamental Truths which constitute a Church, are on both sides unquestioned; and, for that reason, learned Protestants yield them [the Roman] the Name, and Substance of a true Church. Dr. Field also || thus apologizeth for this charitable Tenent of theirs, at least for the times.

7.
|| Vindic. c. 2.
p. 8.
— Reply to
Chalcedon,
p. 345.

|| §. 3. p. 63.

|| Def. part 3.

p. 280.

times before Luther, if not, those since.—Because some men perhaps will think (saith he) that we yield more unto our Adversaries now, than formerly we did; in that we acknowledge the Latine, or Western Churches, subject to Romish Tyranny, before God raised up Luther, to have been the true Churches of God, in which a saving Profession of the Truth of Christ was found—I will first shew, that all our best and most renowned Divines did ever acknowledge as much as I have written. And so he proceeds to urge several Authorities to confirm it.

And thus Mr. Thorndike || saith, — Though I sincerely §. 42. blame the imposing new Articles upon the Faith of Christians; and that of Positions, which I maintain not to be true; yet I must, and do freely profess, that I finde no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoyned to be believed, by it [the Roman Church:] And therefore I must necessarily accept it for a true Church, as in the Church of England I have always known it accepted; seeing there can no question be made, that it continueth the same visible Body, by the succession of Pastors, and Laws, that first were founded by the Apostles (the present Customes [that are] in force, being visibly the corruptions of those Customs, which the Church had from the beginning [I suppose he means, being the same Customs which the Church had from the beginning, though in some manner corrupted.]) For the Idolatries, which I grant to be possible, (though not necessary) to be found in it, by the Ignorance, and carnal Affections of Particulars, (not by command of the Church, or the Laws of it) I do not admit to destroy the salvation of those, who living in the Communion of this Church, are not guilty of the like. There remains therefore in the present Church of Rome the Profession of all the Truth, which it is necessary to the Salvation of all Christians to believe, either in point of Faith, or Manners.—So he saith concerning Prayer to Saints.—That those who admit the Church of Rome to commit Idolatry therein, can by no means grant it to be a Church; the very being whereof supposeth the Worship of one God exclusive to any thing else. And l. 3. c. 23. Concerning Communion in one kinde, he saith, — That they in the Church of Rome, who thirst after the Eucharist in both kinds, do receive the whole Grace of this Sacrament in the one kinde, is necessary to be believed by all, who believe that the Church of Rome remains a Church though corrupt, and that Salvation is to be had in it, and by it.

2. Again; For the Essentials, or Necessary Doctrines in order to Holiness, these Learned Protestants grant, that Holy is an Attribute inseparable from Catholick, [credo, Sanctam, Catholicam Ecclesiam;] And that the Church cannot be the one, unless.

|| Egilog. Conclusion, p. 146.

§. 43.
2.

|| p. 143.

unless it be the other; and, as in the whole, so in the parts, that no particular Church is a part of the Catholick, that hath not the Holiness of the Catholick. — Of which thus the Arch-bishop ||. — If we will keep our Faith, the whole Militant Church must be still Holy. For if it be not so still, then there may be a time, that a falshood may be the Subject of the Catholick Faith; which were no less, then Blasphemy to affirm: For we must still believe the Holy Catholick Church. And if she be not still Holy, then, at the time that she is not so, we believe a falshood under the Article of the Christian Faith. Of this more needs not be said.

§. 44.

3.

3. Again, If under such Governors, the visible Church, preceding the Reformation, is allowed to have been Catholick, and Holy; from these it must needs be granted also, not to have been Heretical, or Schismatical. Which Churches Protestants themselves contra-distinguish to the Catholick Church, and all the Members of it; and in which Churches, dividing from the Unity of the Catholick, no salvation can be had by those, who, if either knowing, or culpably ignorant of, these sins, I mean, the Heresy, or Schism of such Churches, do not actually desert their Communion.

|| p. 139.

|| Vindic. 2.

p. 9.

|| l. 4. c. 2.

For this likewise, See the Quotations out of the Arch-bishop, before §. 37. and out of Dr. Field, before §. 18. and out of Bishop Bramhall, §. 24. — If the whole Church (saith the Arch-bishop ||) can err either by falling away from the foundation, or by Heretical Error in it, she can be no longer Holy; For no Assemblies of Hereticks can be Holy. And Bishop Bramhall || saith, That if a Church become Schismatical, it doth not continue Catholick. And Bellarmine (saith Dr. Field ||) is to be blamed for idle, and needles busying himself in proving that the visible Church never falleth into Heresie, which we most willingly grant. — And (l. 1. c. 7.) he saith, — That the name of Catholick Church distinguisheth men holding the Faith in Unity from Schismaticks; whom as also Hereticks, though he there affirms — to be, in some sort, of the Church [taken more generally] as it distinguisheth men of the Christian Profession from Infidels, yet not of the Church-Catholick, or fully and perfectly of the Church, with hope of Salvation ||.

|| l. 1. c. 14. p. 21

- & c. 7. p. 13.

§. 45.

|| 1208.

And thus Mr. Thorndike in his Letter concerning the present state of Religion || — When we say, we believe the Catholick Church, as part of that Faith whereby we hope to be saved; we do not profess to believe, that there is such a company of men [professing Christianity: See how this crosseth Mr. Chillingworth, quoted §. 4.] but that there is a Corporation of true Christians, excluding Hereticks and Schismaticks, and that we hope to be saved by this Faith,

Faith, as being members of it [of that Corporation]. And this is that, which the stile of the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church signifies; as distinguishing the Body of true Christians, (to wit, so far as Profession goes) from the Conventicles of Hereticks and Schismaticks. For this title of Catholick would signifie nothing, if Hereticks and Schismaticks were not barred the Communion of the Church. Thus he.

The Common Prayers also, used both in the Roman and Protestant Churches on Good Friday; shew the same.—*Oremus (saith the one) pro Hereticis & Schismaticis, ut Deus eos ad Sanctam Matrem Ecclesiam Catholicam, atque Apostolicam revocare dignetur.*—Have mercy Lord (saith the other) upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Hereticks, and so fetch them home to thy Flock—that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one Fold under one Shepherd. But, note by the way, that in the transferring these Good-Friday Collects out of the former Missal into their New Common-Prayer-Book, though the Reformed retained [*Hereticks*], yet they omitted [*Schismaticks*]; [As also in the English Litany reformed, at their Decession from the former Catholick Church, petitioning for *Deliverance* from all false Doctrine and Heresy, they omitted *Schisme*: There it runs, *From all false Doctrine and Heresy, Good Lord deliver us*: But in the newly-corrected Common-Prayer-Book, at the Kings Return, upon a discession of many other Sects from their Church, they now thought good to put in *Schism* too: And now it runs, *From all false Doctrine, Heresy and Schism, &c. Good Lord deliver us.*] And 2ly. note, that they changed the former Expression of *revoca ad Sanctam Matrem Ecclesiam Catholicam, & Apostolicam*, into *Fetch home to thy Flock, to be saved among the Remnant of the true Israelites*: As if the mention of our Holy Mother, the Catholick, Apostolick Church, might occasion in the people some great Mistakes.

In all these passages you may observe, that the Authors forequoted speak not of some, or other in the Church, before *Luther*, to have been *Catholick*, and consequently *holy*, &c. but of the visible Church, consisting of the ruling *Clergy*, and the subject and conforming *Lay*, according to the publick doctrines, and Definitions thereof, as these being not deficient in the Essentials of the Church-Catholick, either as to *Faith*, or *Holiness*: for, such a Church-Catholick they believe always to be; whose doctrine and definitions, discipline and external visible profession, maintained by the Governours thereof, is *Catholick*. And if, in any other sense, we call it a *Catholick Church*, (when we hold its Governours and Doctrines, mean-while, *Heterick* and *Schismatical*)

§. 46.

§. 47.

matical). by reason of *some*, that may be found herein Catholickly perswaded, we may as well call that an heretical Church, the Doctrines and Doctors of which are Catholick, if perhaps *some* only in it be heretically affected. To go on.

- §. 48. Therefore Dr. Field proceeds also so far, as to own the Western Church, that was before Luther, for the Protestants true Mother (for indeed where could he find, at that time, a Church any whit-better, to call Mother) and to confess || : *That she continued the true Church of God until our time—And—To those* (saith he) *that demand of us, where our Church was before Luther began : We answer, it was the known, and apparent Church in the world, wherein all our Fathers lived, and died; wherein Luther and the rest were baptized, &c; & wherein a saving profession of the truth in Christ was found.* In order to which he so far justifies the publick service also of those days, which our Fathers frequented, even the Canon of the Mass it self; as to say, || — *That the using thereof, [& no other was used in those days, than is now] is no proof, that the Church, that then was, was not a Protestant Church, and that both the Liturgie it self, and the profession of such as used it, shew plainly, that the Church that then was, never allowed any Romish error; And again, so far justifies he the doctrine of this Western Church before Luther, which he owns as Catholick, and the Protestant's Mother, as to affirm || : That none of those points of false doctrine and error, which the Roman Church now maintaineth, and the Protestants condemn, were the doctrines of that Church [before Luther] constantly delivered [He must mean constantly even for the present Age before Luther; for in that Age he acknowledgeth it Catholick] or generally received by all them that were of it, but doubtfully broached and devised without all certain resolution, or factiously defended by some certain only, &c. [By which passage in Dr. Field, it seems; that, look how many Doctrines (of those now condemned by the Protestants,) may appear to have been, in the Church, (I say not here, the Catholick; but the Latin Church; for of this he speaks) before Luther not doubtfully broached; but, in her Councils resolved, in her publick Liturgies conformed to; and generally received; (Generally, not as including every single person, for so perhaps were not the doctrine of the Trinity, or of Christs Incarnation, received; but so generally received by the then Western Church-Governors, as is necessary for the ratification of the Decrees of their Representatives met in Councils: for more than this cannot, rationally, be required); so many Doctrines he will acknowledge for Catholick; and,*
- || f. 3. c. 6.
- || 3. part p. 880.
- || Append. 3. l. p. 224.
- || 3. l. p. 81.

and, in obedience thereto, shew a filial Duty to this his *Mother*.]

And therefore, after this, to defend the discession of the Reformed from, and their present non-communication with, the present || *Western Church*, he seeks to relieve himself, in saying, || *That part p. 880.*
this Roman Church is not the same now, as it was when Luther be- & Append.
gan.—Nor the external face of Religion then, the now professed to. 3. l. p.
Roman Religion.—And further, || That the errors of the present 187, 224.
Roman Church are Fundamental. || p. 880.

But, in this defence of his, there be 3. things very observable. 1. That *Luther*, and all in his daies, that then left the Roman Church, are hereby condemned. 2. That those who then or now admit not the *Publick Service* of that Church; and the *Canon* of the *Mass*, are no less culpable. 3. That the Present Roman Church is now ceased to be any part of the Church *Catholic*. All which three great Paradoxes (as to many other Protestants) he unwarily runs into, by that way which he takes both to justify the Departure from the present Roman Church; and yet, the more rationally to satisfy that demand; where his Church was, before *Luther*.

1st. The Discession of Protestants in *Luthers* time, or of *Luther* himself, from that Church, (*which was not the same, as he saith, then, as now; nor the Errors which Protestants now condemn, when the doctrines of it, but of a faction in it*) remains by this still culpable; For none may desert the *Communion* of a Church, because of the corrupt doctrines or practices of a faction in it. But if he supposeth the Clergy, and Ecclesiastical Governors of such Church, who impose such doctrines, and require unjust conditions of their Communion, to be that Faction, then are the *Doctrins*, and the *Faction*, to be charged on the very Church it self, and not on a party in it; and the Roman Church then to be stiled the same it is now; (as a Church, whereof all the ruling Clergy holds and imposeth *Arrianism*, is rightly stiled an *Arrian Church*, if any can be so.) But this expression, *Dr. Field* saw, he had reason to forbear.

[And therefore to avoid this rock I suppose, *Bishop Bramhall* || thought fit to take another course; and for the defence of the lawfulness of this first discession of Protestants (which discession, the Bishop of *Chalcedon* urged, to have proceeded those grievances, and impediments of Communion, that Protestants of later times chiefly complain of; namely, the many new Definitions and *Anathemas* of the Council of *Trent*, and new Articles and Creed of *Pius* the fourth) seems to make a contrary plea to *Dr.*

H

Field

§. 49.

Apol. 3.

That part p. 880.

& Append.

to. 3. l. p.

187, 224.

p. 880.

§. 50.

§. 51.

§. 52.

Reply to

Chalcedon

p. 263.

Field (though this also insufficient). For, these *vi* points (saith he) which *Pius* the fourth comprehended in a new Symbol or Creed, were obtruded upon us before by his Predecessors, [and therefore before the ratification, or obliging authority, of the Council of *Trent*] as necessary Articles of the Roman Faith, and required, as necessary Articles of their Communion; so, as we must either receive these, or utterly lose them. This is the only difference, that *Pius* the fourth dealt in gross, his Predecessors by retail. They fashioned the several rods, and he bound them up into a bundle. Here then you see the rods, that *Pius*, and before him the Council of *Trent*, bound up into a Bundle, were (according to this Author) severally fashioned before: which must be so, in the Synods of this Holy Catholick Church that preceded *Luther*, and that is the Protestant's Mother: (a thing denied by *Dr. Field*). But if Bishop *Bramhall* understands the times before *Pius* only, of the Council of *Trent* that began to sit under the Predecessors of *Pius*, the Query still remains, concerning the lawful Grounds of the first Protestant-dissession, from the former Church; which discession preceded the beginning of that Council, above twenty years. The first Session of that being A.D. 1545. and the first Revolt of *Luther* and his Complices, before 1520; And the Body of their New Articles of Religion, concluded on, and all bound up into one Bundle, A.D. 1530. Burthen, the Conclusion and Confirmation of the Council of *Trent*, and so, Obligation of all persons to its Decrees, not hapening till almost 20 years more after the first Session of it; so much longer time still did this Discession of Protestants precede the chief cause, or Reason, they give for it. □

§ 33.

21. By this Defence of *Dr. Field*, The Discession made by Protestants from the former Publick Service of the Church, and the Canon of the Mass, (a Service established by a lawful Superior Authority) must be also culpable: Which Canon, before *Luthers* days, *Dr. Field* affirms, contained in it no Romish Errors: And in which, since *Luthers* time, nothing hath been altered.

§ 34.

34. The present Church of *Rome*, being said by him, since *Luthers* time, to have erred in Fundamentals, is hereby ceased to be any part of the Church Catholick; and (further), no salvation is to be had in her at all, even to the invincibly ignorant; if *Dr. Field* holds, no truths to be fundamental to salvation, but such without which salvation cannot possibly be had; Concerning which see what he saith, 31. 4. c. p. 79.

To such straits are Learned men driven, when Interest engaged them to sustain a wrong Cause.

CHAP. VI.

The Chief Modern Controversies decided by former obliging Councils.

That, according to the former Concessions, made in the Fourth Chapter, §. 22. &c. (If so enlarged, as ancient Church-practice, and Reason requires,) all, or most of the Protestant Controversies are by former (obliging) Councils already decided, §. 56. n. 1. &c.

An Instance hereof, in the Controversy of the Corporal Presence in the Eucharist, or Transubstantiation, §. 57.

After the Protestants various assertions touching the Ecclesiastical Guide thus particularly related and discussed, come we now to make a more general Reflection on the former Discourse as to the two principal Concessions made by the moderate Protestants therein.

The 1st (Chap. 4. §. 22. &c.) their conceding the General Councils in any Age to be unerrable in Necessaries, when such Councils are universally accepted by the Church-Catholick disjunctive.

The 2^d (chap. 5. §. 41. &c.) their conceding the Western Church before and at the coming of Luther to have been Catholick and indeficient as to all Necessaries and Essentials either of Faith or Holiness.

In the First of these then, these Divines freely grant our Lords assistance to the Church-Catholick such, as that she shall for ever be an unerring Guide in Necessaries: [a thing denied by Mr. Chillingworth], because of a Consequence thereof, which he foresaw; Namely, That we must take her judgment, and guidance also in this point, what points are fundamental, or necessary; and then what follows, what will follow? Namely, That we are to believe this Church in all Points, wherein she saith, she is unerring. And upon this, do grant also, her General Council, or Representative, (she having no other way to reach, direct, define any thing; or at least, no other way so clear, and evident) to be unerring in Necessaries; provided that such Council be universally accepted; and not opposed, or reversed, by the Church-Catholick in another following Representative; but received by a general, tacit at least, approbation, and conformity to its Decrees. Where also it is conceded, that, a Council, for its meeting less General, if ha-

§. 55.

§. 56. n. 1.

|| See before, §. 4.

ving an universal acceptance, is equivalent thereto.) And hence they make also frequent Appeal to these Councils, as the *supreme* and ultimate Ecclesiastical Court, for settling Unity of Doctrine, and Peace, in the Church; and that, wherein they promise victory to their Cause, and an end of Debates:

To reminde you of some of them:

§. 56. n. 2.
|| p. 27.
|| Vindic. of
the Church
of Engl.
p. 27.

|| Reply to
Chalced.
Prefat.

|| Of Heres.
§. 14. n. 6.

|| c. 2. §. 3.

|| Div. Eng.
and Rom.
Cb. p. 59.

§. 56. n. 3.

☐ A General Council, after it is admitted by the whole Church, is then infallible (saith the Archbishop) [he means, in Necessaries] — But Bishop Bramhall further, — When inferior Questions (saith he) not fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgments, are obliged to passw obedience, to possess their souls in peace, and patience. And they who shall oppose the Authority, and shall disturb the peace of the Church, deserve to be punished as Hereticks. And I submit my self (saith he) to the Representative Church, that is, to a free General Council, or so General as can be procured. — And, Schism Guarded, p. 136. — or, in defect of that, to a free Occidental Council, as general as may be. And thus Dr. Hammond, — We do not believe, that any General Council truly such, ever did, or shall, err in any matter of Faith; nor shall we further dispute the authority then we shall be duly satisfied of the universality of any such [Council] — And, Answer to Catholick Gentleman, A Congregation that is fallible, may yet have authority to make Decisions; and to require Inferiors to acquiesce to their Determinations, &c. And — The Belief, and Practices, we forsook, were not Doctrines defined by the Church: (saith Dr. Ferne). ☐

Upon such Concession then, both concerning the Authority, and also Infallibility of Councils universally-accepted; and upon these appeals made to them, here are referred to the examination of all disinterested, and consciencious, Christians these four Considerables following.

I.

1. The first Considerable is: Whether the necessary points, wherein our Lord is supposed perpetually so to assist his Church, (or her General Councils universally-accepted), as that she is infallible, and doth not err in the decision of them, and consequently, whereto all her subjects are obliged to yield their assent, ought not to be extended so far, as to comprehend some at least of those points, (I mean, either the Negative, or Affirmative of them), the disputes about which, (as things of the highest moment) have so miserably afflicted the Western Churches now for so long a time. The necessary consequence of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, (as many Protestants maintain), is the committing of Idolatry, in worshipping a piece of bread for our Lord Christ.

Is.

Is not this point then necessary and Fundamental to Christian Religion, that, in a Council meeting to decide it, the contrary to *Transubstantiation* should be therein determined? For the Affirmative can never be determined in such a Council generally accepted, where the Negative is necessary to be believed? If the belief of God's essential attributes is a necessary and fundamental point of faith, is not the defining the contrary, and giving some of these Attributes to a creature, in allowing *Saint-Invocation*, (a thing, with which Protestants charge the Roman Church) erring in a Fundamental? and if it be, then cannot a General Council, universally accepted, so define. The same may perhaps be said of many other points, *Moris of works, Worship of Images, Communion in one kinde*, according to what esteem many Protestants have of these errors; aggravated also by their fancy, that the Pope is *Antichrist*. But, suppose none of them to be in necessities; yet, they being affirmed, by the more moderate Reformed, to be errors very grievous, damnable, &c. then, may not a right belief of these points be thought necessary so far, as that the Catholick Church, and such a Council, may be presumed to receive from our Lord a continual preservation in a right Faith of them, if the Error in them be pretended so grievous? And I desire that, for this, D. Ham- || Of Heres. 9.13.
mond's || words quoted below, §. 59. may be well weighed. As
likewise that this be considered, whether it is not all reason, that the Church, or these Councils, not private men, or Inferiors, should judge of this Necessity.

2ly. If this may not be granted; that any of these §. 56. n. 4.
modern Controversies are about *Necessaries*; or the points such, that the Church-Catholick, or her General Council, universally accepted, cannot in their Definitions, err in them; and so an Assent to such Definitions be due from her Subjects; The Second Considerable is: Whether at least, when such Councils define them, all particular, *Persons*, and *Churches*, ought not to yield the external Obedience; to them, of *Silence*, and not any further opposing, or contradiction; So that these private men, or also Churches, may not reserve still to themselves, (lest some Truth should be oppressed), new *Remonstrances*, and Demonstrations, and a *Liberty*, (if upon these Remonstrances the Church-Catholick neglect to assemble another Council; or, it called, err again in the result,) a *Liberty*, I say (especially if it be a Church National that remonstrates), to reform, for themselves, such Errors of Councils. For, with such Reservations, what signify their former appeals to, or to what purpose, any Meeting of, such Coun-

Councils? when he saith, *1st* The present Controversies are not allowed by these men to be in *Necessaries*; (in all which necessities the Roman Church; and Reformed are said by them to be already fully agreed); And *2^{ly}*, whenas they will yield neither any internal, nor external Obedience to any such Conciliary Decrees, in the fraying of *non-necessaries*. But, if such an external submission of *non-contradiction* be thought fit here to be allowed by them, though that internal of *assent* cannot be obtained; yet this seems to secure the Church's peace: for, thus a Controverſie, once defined, cannot be revived, to the disturbance thereof; and, if they say, some Truth sometime may happen thus to suffer; yet being in a non-necessary, (as they say it is), it may be spared; Neither, if this latter Duty had been duly performed by our Ancestors, do I see, how the past Reformation, as to many points, could have found any entrance. And therefore, though some of the formerly-recited appeals of Protestants promise fairly for such an absolute submission to Councils; yet the Arch-Bishop seems to allow no more than a conditional one, and with an, *If*, or *Unless* still annexed to such as either have been; or, may be, had. — I pray you look in him §. 32. p. 227. — Far better (saith he) is that Inconvenience [viz. of tolerating an Error, till another General Council meet] than this other; that any authority, less than a General Council, should rescind the Decrees of it; unless it err manifestly, and intolerably. — And again, *Ibid.* — No way must lie open to private men to refuse Obedience, till the Council be heard, and weighed: as well as that, which they say against it; yet with Bellarmine's Exception still [here mis-applied; for Bellarmine] constantly denies that a General Council, lawfully proceeding and confirmed by the Pope, can err in any matter of Faith, which the Bishop here affirms,] so the Error be not manifestly inollerable. Nor is it fit for private men, in such cases as this, upon which the whole Peace of Christendom depends, to argue thus; The Error appears, Therefore the Determination of the Council is ipso jure invalid. But this is far the safer way (I say still, when the Error is neither fundamental, nor in itself manifest), to argue thus: The Determination is by equal authority, and that secundum jus, according to Law, declared to be invalid. Therefore the Error appears. [Where you cannot but mark the Reservations. — Unless it err manifestly. — So the Error be not manifestly inollerable. — When the Error is neither Fundamental, nor in itself manifest. Err manifestly: i. e. in their Judgment too.]

¶ De Concil.
l. 2. c. 8.

gly. If this submission of non-gainfaying at least, may be once granted; Then the third thing, recommended to a diligent Examination, is; Whether not only the *Roman*, but all the *Occidental* Churches, joined with the *Western*, and *Prime Patriarch*, (the *Exordium Unitatis*, as *S. Cyprian* ||, with *Bishop Bramhall's* approbation, styles him) ||, and the Councils that have been heretofore assembled in the *West*, be not, for these *Doctrines* wherein we find the *Greek Churches* also consenting with them, and so giving a *Tacite Acceptation* of them, in such a sense the whole, as that any Christian, especially a Member of the *Western Church*, ought to take these for their *suprem Guide* in defect of any greater Meeting; and ought to yield obedience of Assent to them in defining *Necessaries*; or, in not *Necessaries*, of non-contradiction. And whether a more General, or any fuller, acceptation of the Definitions of such Councils by the *Church-Catholick*, (which acceptation also, when any Council, for the Meeting, is not so numerous as others have been, supplies the defect) can rationally be required, than that, which is set down, before, §. 38. 3. N. & C.

§. 56. n. 5.

3.

|| *Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. Schism guarded, p. 4. 25.*

4ly. Whether, most, or at least some, of the chiefest points, of present Controversie between *Catholicks*, and *Protestants*, have not been decided by former Councils so accepted. V Which he may be pleased to examine in the points mentioned, *Disse. 3. §. 26. & c.*

4.

But, for a present Example applied to the precedent Rules, I will annex here a brief relation ||, of the past proceedings of the Church in the decision of one of the main points of Controversie, which yet, notwithstanding such former Determination, remains still called in question by the *Reformed*: Namely, this, whether in the *Eucharist* there is a *Corporal presence of Christ*, and a *Substantial Conversion* of the Elements of Bread and Vine into his Body, and Blood?

§. 57.

|| See *Berninus* and *Blondel's Esclairciss. sur. L. Eucharist.*

This *Corporal presence*, and *Substantial Conversion*, then, (to relate the proceedings about it as briefly, as possibly I may) long ago *Berengarius*, and some Followers of his, denied; were complained of; two Councils called; one after another; at *Rome*, and at *Verceilles*, Anno Dom. 1050: *Berengarius* summoned; and, he not appearing, his heterodox Opinions condemned. He, (according to the now *Protestant Grounds*) thinking his, a Doctrine of great consequence; and the Decree of these two Councils a manifest Error; and that himself had evident Scripture, and Demonstration against it, judged himself freed from the Obedience

of

of silence, or non-contradiction, to these Councils; and so he, with his Followers, publickly justified his old Tenent, desiring a reversing, by some new Council, of the former Sentence passed against it.

Upon this reviv'd disturbance of the Church, another Council, five years after the former, is assembled at *Tours*, 1055. not far distant from *Angers*, where he was *Arch-Diakon*. Here himself, with others of his party, was present; his Cause pleaded; his Demonstrations considered; and, after all, his Opinion again condemned; himself also recanting it.

The Council dismissed, he finds yet other new Reasons, or a greater strength in his former; and falls again to the abetting, maintaining, and spreading abroad his old Doctrine.

A Fourth Council, upon these new Troubles of the Church, four years after the last, was called at *Rome* 1059; where himself also was present; some say, long Disputation there had; his new Plea for it found too light, and rejected; and his Opinion opposing a Substantial Conversion again condemned, both by himself, and by the Council, consisting of 103 Bishops.

The third time this man revolts; and publisheth a Writing (answered by *Lanfranck*, afterward Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*) wherein he complains, that some particular Enemies of his swayed the former Council, and had made him to swear contradictions.

These new Imputations occasioned a Fifth Council to be called at *Rome*, A. D. 1078. In which were new Disputings; his last Cavils censured; and the Article of a Substantial Conversion further vindicated; and his Error of the Substance of the Bread remaining, again condemned by this Council, and, ultimately, recanted by himself. And so this person, who was supposed by Protestants to have been raised up by God to vindicate his Truth, yet was permitted by him to dy, in their Judgment, a Defector of it: i. e. reconciled to the Doctrine of the Church.

§. 38.

|| *Sur l'En-*
char. c. 20.

Such was the Sentence of five several Councils, if we may believe D. *Blondel* || (one reviewing another) against *Berengarius* and his Party, opposing a Corporal presence, these questioned Persons being present in three of these Councils, and pleading their Cause: The same Arguments (as well appear by the writers of those times, *Lanfranck*, *Guismond*, *Algerus*, to any one, that pleaseth to peruse them) then refused, that are still urged: the same objections out of Fathers then pressed, as are still produced anew by the reformed, and with the same Answers repelled: All these Councils too, (if some of them, in the Membrs thereof, less numerous, yet) universally accepted by all the

the Western Churches, where this Controversie was only agitated; Not one single Bishop thereof, that is known, dissenting, or siding with the *Berengarians*. Look we for more satisfaction yet?

When the Fervor of parties in this matter was much allayed; and the Church had sufficient leisure to consider, and digest the former Conciliary Decrees; above a hundred years after the last of the Councils fore-mentioned, the great *Lateran* Council was assembled under *Innocent* the 3d. in which were the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, and of *Hierusalem* in person, and the Substitutes, * of the Patriarch of *Antioch*: then sick, *Episcopus Antheradensis*; and * of the *Alexandrian* Patriarch, lying under the *Sarazen* yoke, *Germanus* his Deacon.

¶ 'Tis true indeed (as it is objected), that some of these Patriarchs were then *Latines*, because, both *Constantinople*, and *Hierusalem* being held in possession (the one, for near 60. the other for near a 100. years) by the *Latines*, *Latine* Patriarchs were then elected; (as sometimes *Greeks* also, by the power of the Emperors, have been Bishops of *Rome*); but yet they were the *Lawful*, and the only Patriarchs of those Sees in that time; ¶

And present there were, besides these, a considerable number of other *Eastern* Bishops, the whole Council consisting of 412 Bishops, and 70 Archbishops. Now this Council again, in stead of reversing, declared for, a *Substantial Conversion*; where also first, (i. e. in a Council), was used the name of *Transubstantiation*. Two hundred years after this again; the Council of *Florence* declared likewise for the same, in the Articles of Instruction to the *Jacobines*, and *Armenians*, in these words—*Ipsorum verborum Christi virtute, substantia panis in Corpus Christi; & substantia vini in sanguinem, convertuntur*. Which declaration, though made after the departure of the *Greek*: (whom the *Turks* Invasion hastned away) yet it was fully agreeable to their doctrine: Nor had the *Latine*, and *Greek* Church then any difference concerning the *Substantial Conversion* of the Elements into Christ's Body, but only by what words this mutation was effected. For which thing see the plain Confessiou of Bishop *Forbes*||, against *Chemnitius*, and others of || *De Euch.* his own party. *Græci recentiores* (saith he, there naming them) p. 412. See in suis opusculis apertissime, *Transubstantiationem consentiunt*. Et in below. *Dis.* *Concilio Florentino non fuit questio inter Græcos & Latinos (ut* 3. §. 82. & c. *Cherianitus, alique multi Protestantes affirmant*), *An Panis substantialiter in Corpus Christi mutaretur; sed, quibusnam verbis illa ineffabilis mutatio fieret; An solis verbis Domini; an vero etiam Sacerdotis & Ecclesie oratione*. And this did all these Councils, without any ensuing opposition; or the Church-Catholick's assembling

it self in any other Council, in so many Centuries, to reverse such a Decree. If there was, let it be named.

§. 59.

Now, If the Decree of so many Synods, so often weighing the Adversaries reasons and evidences, was not sufficient for settling such a point, at least as to the obedience of future silence, and non-contradiction, and, as to suffering the Church to enjoy her peace, what can hereafter be sufficient? Or, can we ever hope, that any controversie shall be finally determined, or ended by any future Council, if this is not by these forepast? Can there be any ground here to question the integrity, or lawful proceedings of so many Councils, at such a distance from one another, all concurring in the same judgment, for a corporal Presence, and a substantial mutation? Or, can there be any new Light in this Point (since there are no new Revelations) attainable in these present times, which those were not capable, or had no notice of? Or, if there could, do not much the major part of the present Clergy, and Ecclesiastical Governors of Christianity still sway on the same side, against any present evidence pretended?

||Of Heref.

§. 13. n. 2, 3.

If we consider (saith Dr. Hammond ||) Gods great, and wise, and constant Providence, and care over his Church; his desire, that all men should be saved, and in order to that end, come to the knowledge of all necessary Truth; his promise, that he will not suffer his faithful Servants to be tempted above what they are able; nor permit Scandals, and False Teachers to prevail to the seducing of the very Elect, his most pious godly Servants; If, I say, we consider these, and some other such like General Promises of Scriptures, wherein this Question [about the Errability of Councils] seems to be concerned, we shall have reason to believe; that God will never suffer all Christians to fall into such a temptation, as it must be in case the whole Representative should err in matter of faith, [I add, to define, therein, any thing contrary to the Apostles depositum; and which Christians may not safely believe; or, without idolatry, practise]; and therein finde approbation and reception among all those Bishops, and Doctors of the Church-diffused, which were out of the Council. And though in this case the Church might remain a Church, (and so the destructive gates of hell not prevail against it) and still retain all parts of the Apostle's Depositum in the hearts of some faithful Christians, which had no power in the Council to oppose the Decree; or, out of it, to resist the General approbation; yet still the testimony of such a General Council, so received, and approved, would be a very strong Argument, and so, a very dangerous temptation to every weak and pious Christian; and it is piously to be believed, though

though not infallibly certain, — That God will not permit his Ser-
vants to fall into that Temptation. — [Thus Dr. Hammond, whose
words I desire may be seriously considered with application to this
great Controversie of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, and the
Sacrifice of the Mass.] We do not believe (saith the same Do-
ctor ||) that any General Council, truly such, ever did, or shall || Ibid. §. 14.
err in any matter of Faith ||. We are most ready in all our dis- n. 6.
relines to stand to the judgment of the truly Catholick Church, and its
lawful Representative, a free General Council ||: Or, in defect of || See be-
that, a free Occidental Council ||, saith Bishop Bramhall. || fore, §. 46.
seems very fit and necessary for the peace of Christendom, that a Ge- || Vind. c.
neral Council, [supposed] thus erring, should stand in force, till evi- 2. p. 9.
dence of Scripture, or demonstration, make the Errors to appear, so as || Schism
that another Council of equal authority reverse it, Saith Arch- p. 136.
Bishop Lawd || — Again. An Argument necessary, and demon- || p. 227.
strative is such (saith he) as, being proposed to any man, and un-
derstood, the Mind cannot chuse, but inwardly assent unto it. So
it is not enough to think, or to say it is demonstrative; the light of a
demonstrative Argument is the evidence, which it hath in its self to
all that understand it. Well: but because all understand it not; If
a quarrel be made [as was by Berengarius four or five times] Who
shall decide it? No question, but a General Council. — For if
it be evident to any man, then to so many learned men, as are in a
Council doubtless: And if they cannot but assent, it is hard to
think them so impious, that they will define against it. And if that
which is thought evident to any man, be not evident to such a grave
Assembly, 'tis probable 'tis no Demonstration, and the Producers of it
ought to rest, and not to trouble the Church ||. Thus Arch-Bishop Lawd, || p. 245,
How then I say in the present point, can the reformed, reviving 246.
the former Arguments of Bertram, Scotus Erigena, Berengari-
us, &c. still trouble the Church again with urging of them,
after the judgment of so many Councils already passed upon
them? If the reformed tie us to obedience, as of Assent, when the
Council brings evident Scripture, or Demonstration; so of Si-
lence, when we cannot bring it against the Council; and, after
our bringing what we think Demonstrative, tie us to stand to the
judgment of the Council, whether it be so, or no, then from hence
it follows: that as we may not gain-say a second Council, after
our Demonstrations proposed, and disallowed by it: so we may
not gain-say the former, or the very first, Council, if we pro-
duce no new demonstrations, but such as were considered by
such Council, and rejected. Now, if Councils are thus to judge
of Demonstrations brought against their Decrees, and the

Contradictour to acquiesce in their judgment; Can any desire a fairer Judicature by Councils in any matter (for silencing future disputes; if not, for uniting variety of opinions), than there hath already been, of this? And is there any reason, that Protestants should refer themselves in this point (as they do) to the judgment of a new Council? If all these Councils, successively, erred in this point so manifestly, as that they could not lawfully oblige their subjects, (especially these bringing no new Arguments,) to silence; the next, and the next to that, of such Councils as ever we can hope for, may err so too, and the same obedience of silence be denied to them; whilst, one pretended Evidence or Demonstration quelled, another new one starts up, and demands satisfaction.

§. 60.

But, if these Councils be invalid for establishing the belief, or at least the non-opposition, of a substantial Conversion. Let us see the proceedings of the Reformation here for repealing the Acts of these Councils, and establishing the contrary to them.

After all these Councils forenamed; and the same resolution passed again in the Council of Trent A.D. 1551. added to them; A.D. 1562. a Synod is called at London of two Provinces only of the West, consisting of about twenty four Bishops, and two Metropolitans; (I fear, several of them meer Usurpers, the former Bishops of the same Sees then still living.) And by these, against all the former Councils abovesaid, it is decreed: That the change of the substance of the bread, and wine in the Eucharist, is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture; and overthrows the nature of a Sacrament. [If then the rest of Christendom have no more, than Protestants here say they have; for many ages they have had no Sacrament of the Lords Supper amongst them.] Next; in obedience to this their decree, they tie their subjects not to silence, or a non-contradiction of it, but to subscribe that they acknowledge it, [i.e. confess, believe, it] to be agreeable to the Word of God, [i.e. to be true]: An obedience, which themselves, though subjects, denyed to the decree of all those preceding Councils, wherein the judgments of all the Bishops and Metropolitans of the western world concurred, and, amongst the rest, of those of these two Provinces also, and yet doth their Synod require it.

|| Artic. 28.

|| Synod.
1603. Can.
63.

And their requiring this, thought to be, rationally, thus defended; Because, Though it is not impossible, but that such Synod may err; yet it may be certain, that in something it doth not err. And so; to such point it may enjoyn assent, because the thing determined is so evident in Scripture, as that all denying of it must be sinful. || But mean-while, you see, all these Councils have denied,

§. 61.
|| Dr. Still.
p. 542.
|| M. Whisby
p. 100.

what this Synod of twenty six Bishops is certain of; and certain from evidence of Scripture; *an evidence*, the perusal of which all those Councils had, as well as these. Here let a sober Christian judge, if assent be held due to this London-Synod, upon such a pretended certainty of theirs; is it not to those other, much rather *to those others*, I say, who were incomparably more numerous; accepted by the whole West for many Ages; and adhered to still by the greatest part thereof; who had before them the *Scriptures*, and the *traditive* Exposition of them; weighing the Arguments that are still on foot; who met so often; and concluded still in the same Judgment. But, if these other Councils are justified by the practice of this *English Synod*, either in their requiring *assent*, or at least *silence*, thus is the *Reformation* rendered unlawful; as likewise their appeal to future Councils; which future can afford us no more just satisfaction, than the forepast. As for that refuge, usually sought, their flying to the contrary judgment, or *non-acceptance*, of the *Eastern Churches*, in this point, it helps not. For 1st, (besides a considerable presence of *Grecian Bishops*, that there was in some of these Councils); as to *acts of approbation* or *non-opposition* in this point, the Greek Churches have never been found to have made the least *anti-declaration*. And 2^{ly}. You may see below, *Disc. 3. §. 83. &c.* the Testimonies both of their own Writers, and also of several Protestants, shewing their accord herein with the Western Churches.

As for the Appeal, that is made by many to our senses, that they may be consulted rather, than the Church, or the *Faithers*, (who yet had as perfect an information from their senses, as we from ours), for the decision of this point; and as for the many *contradictions* that are mulctured up by them, out of Philosophy, and from natural Reason, against it. I think all are here agreed, that the contrary testimony of faith, sense, or the seeming *contradictions* of Reason are not to be regarded, where *Divine Revelation* declares any thing to be Truth. See M. Tilson's Rule. p. 271. D. Taylor's Real pres.

That which I am now upon, is faith Dr. Stillingfleet in the place where he urgeth such contradictions of sense and reason, to Transubstantiation. *How far reason may add, or subtract, is to be submitted to divine Authority, in case of certainty, that there is a divine Revelation for what I am to believe.* [viz. in p. 117. & case of certainty of contrary Divine Revelation, our Reason is to be submitted.] To this, give me leave to add the judgment of two, or three Protestants more in this matter here a little to check by.

by their own party the remanent of those who so peremptorily admit the arbitrement of *sense*, & *natural reason* in mysteries of Religion. The 1st is, that submission of Dr. Taylor's (in *Real Pres.* p. 240.) after he had numbered up many apparent contradictions, not only in respect of a *natural*, but (as he saith) of an *absolute*, possibility of *Transubstantiation*, (from p. 207 to 237.) — Yet, saith he, — *Let it appear that God hath affirmed Transubstantiation; and I for my part will burn all my Arguments against it, and make publick amends.* [All my Arguments (i.) of apparent contradictions, and impossibilities.] — And p. 237. To this Objection, that we believe the Doctrine, of the Trinity; and of the Incarnation; of our Saviour's being born of a pure Virgin, &c. clause, *verbo*; and of the Resurrection with identity of bodies; (in which the Socinians find absurdities and contradictions) notwithstanding seeming impossibilities; and therefore, why not believe Transubstantiation? He Answers, *That if there were as plain Revelation of Transubstantiation; as of the other, then this Argument were good; and if it were possible for a thousand times more Arguments to be brought against Transubstantiation, yet (saith he) we are to believe the Revelation in despite of them all.* [Now I pray you observe, that none can believe a thing true upon what motive soever, which he first knows certainly, to be false; or (which is all one) certainly to contradict; or to be, not *naturally*, but *absolutely*, impossible (which therefore, it is strange that Dr. Taylor affirms himself to know concerning Transubstantiation)] : For these, we say, are not verifiable by a divine power; and therefore I may say; should divine power declare any such thing a Truth, it would transcend it self.]

H p. 107,
236.

Again, (in *Liberty of prophecy* §. 20. n. 16. he saith, — *Those, who believe the Trinity in all those Nicenes of Explications, which are in the School, and which now days pass for the Doctrine of the Church, believe them with as much violence to the Principles of Natural, and Supernatural Philosophy, as can be imagined to be in the point of Transubstantiation.* [Yet I suppose himself denies no doctrine about the Trinity, that is commonly delivered in the Schools.] The next is that grave admonition of that learned, and moderate Prelate, Bishop Forbes,

Admodum periculosum (saith he) et nimis aggraver negant multæ Propositiones: Deus posse patrem substantiâ in Corpore Domini convertere. Nihil enim potest Deus omnipotens facere supra caput omnium hominum, anima & Angelorum. Id quidem, quod implicat contradictionem, non potest fieri: concedatur tamen; sed quia in prædictis non minus evidenter constat, quod sit unitas ipsius rei essentia, &c. perinde, quod implicat, & quid non implicat contradictionem,

nem,

nam, magna profecto temeritas est, propter eam manifestam imbecillitatem, Deo limites prescribere; & prefracte negare, omnipotentia sua illum hoc vel illud facere posse. And (p. 305.) — Certe haud pauci (saith he) credimus omnes, quia si ratio humana consulatur, non minus impossibilia esse, & contradictionem manifestam implicare videntur, quam ipsa Transubstantiatio, instans in the doctrine of the Resurrection, of the same numerical Body. And he goes on. (p. 388.) Placet nobis iudicium Theologorum Wirtembergicorum in confessione sua. Anno. 1592. Censilio Tridentino proposita, cap. de Eucharistia. Credimus, inquit, Omnipotentiam Dei tantam esse, ut possit in Eucharistia substantiam panis & vini vel annihilare, vel in Corpus & sanguinem Christi mutare. Sed quod Deus hanc suam absolutam Omnipotentiam in Eucharistia exercent, non videtur esse certa verbo Dei traditum, & apparet veteri Ecclesiae fuisse ignotum. The Third shall be Calvin's Confession of faith, || written two years before his death, || and directed to the Emperor, and Princes of Germany. — Perro, (saith he), qui nos accusant, quod Dei potentiam denegent a nobis, valde sunt in nos injurii. Non enim hic quaeritur, quid Deus possit, sed quid verbo suo velit, extra quod nihil nobis quaerendum, ut hoc, aut illud divinumus. Quare illum questionem omittamus; an Deus possit facere, ut Christi Corpus sit ubique; sed cum animi modestia intra istos Scripturae fines consistimus, quae prohibet, Christum induisse corpus nostro corpori per omnia simile. Retinenda extollimus Dei potentiam magis, quam illi, qui nos istiusmodi probris infamant. Faciamur enim ipsam illam Christi a nobis, secundum humanam naturam, distantiam non impedire, qua minus in seipso nos vivificet, habiter in nobis, nosque adeo participes reddat ipsiusmet substantiae carnis suae, & sanguinis, virtute incomprehensibili sancti sui Spiritus. Ex quo apparet in re salummosum esse, quod nobis imponitur: quasi nampe fingeremus suos terminos Dei potentiae; placuit Philosophorum; & atque omnis nostra Philosophia una est, simpliciter admittere, quod Scriptura nos docet. And, de vera Christiana pacificatione ratione, c. 11. speaking of the Eucharist. — Quasi vera (saith he), hic de Christi potentia disputetur. — Rerum omnium conversionem fieri posse a Christo nos quoque faciemur.

Vid. Har-
mon. Conf.

Lib. Epist.
p. 572.

This then I hope may be said, with the approbation of Protestants, that the interposings of sense (though indeed in the Eucharist there is no error in our senses, all that being really there, which they perceive there; but in our reason only; arguing from the position of the accidents to the position of the subject), or the interposing of Reason and Philosophy, are not to be hearkened to in this matter, till first is be cleared, what is the divine Revelation

|| Tillotson
p. 276.
§. 64.
2.

tion concerning it: which divine Revelation so often as it appears to have declared any thing contrary to them, we may, with modesty enough, use that expression, *causlessly censured*, || *That we have learnt, not so answer such Arguments, but to despise them.* (2ly,) All thus acknowledging their submission to *divine Revelation*; This hath been amply produced out of the *Scriptures*, For a *corporal* presence of Christ's Body, and a *Conversion* of the consecrated Elements into it. Many Texts urged, if taken in their most *literal, proper, and natural*, sense, very express for it, as *Mat. 26. 26.* — *Mark 14. 22.* — *Luke 22. 19.* — *Jo. c. 6. 51, 53, 54.* (who's speaking of it here, omits it in the History of the Passion;) *1 Cor. 11. 24, 27, 29.* — *10. 16.* In which Texts, it is very observable, 1st. That the words of *Institution* are still repeated punctually by four several sacred Writers (*Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul*), (without any *variation*, or Exposition of any impropriety in them: whereas it is not usuall so constantly to retain, without Explication, a *tropical, or figurative* speech; especially in a matter, where the *truth* is necessary to be known. 2^d Again, that the fourth of these Writers, cautiously as it were, useth not his own stile in this matter, as in others; but chuseth to deliver our Lords command punctually in his own words, with this Preface to it, [*what I have received, that I deliver, &c.*] And 3^d. That our Saviour also in these words seconds his first expression, *Hoc est Corpus meum* (without changing afterward any impropriety in them) with the like words following *Hic est sanguis*; and then confirmeth both these with a *quod traditur* and *qui effundetur* (i. e.) on the Cross; to shew he was real in these words, and meant no *Figure*.

Notwithstanding this, the true *sense* of these Scriptures was called in question by a party (not now only, but eight hundred years ago); who contended, that they were, not properly, but figuratively, to be understood. And, upon this, the usual remedy, for the right understanding of Scriptures controverted, was, then, repaired to; and the same *supreme Ecclesiastical Judge* consulted, for deciding and declaring the true, and *traditive* sense of these Scriptures, in this important controversie concerning the *real, substantial, corporal* Presence of our Lords Body, as was formerly, for declaring the traditive sense of the Scriptures controverted, concerning the *Divinity of Christ*. A General Council, (i. e. the most general that the times would permit) was assembled in the West, in our Forefathers days, nay, of these more than one; as hath been shewed ||; a *substantial* Conversion of the Elements; and a *corporal* Presence declared to be the *traditive* sense

|| §. 57. &c.

sense of these Scriptures; and a reverence suitable required in this great *mystery*; not one Bishop in these Councils, for any thing we know, in the whole Church of God at that time dissenting; and those of the Eastern Churches, absent, consenting in the same judgment||. Say, what more can be done? Ought|| See *Disc.*
not Sense, Reason, Philosophy, here to be silenced? and 3. §. 82. &c.
ought not such a Decree to be, if not assented to, yet (even in the Judgment of those learned Protestant Divines before quoted||) acquiesced in so far, as not to be by any con- || §. 56. n. 2.
tradicted.

But (3ly.) what, now, if many of those contradictions, and absurdities, which are urged against the *Corporal presence* of the Catholicks, do as much overthrow that *real presence*, that is maintained by the Protestants, I mean by the Calvinists, and so many in the Church of *England*. as have not deserted their Forefathers; and, to flie the farther from the Church of *Rome*, are gone quite over into the Camp of *Zuinglius*, changing a *real* into merely a *spiritual* presence; or a presence only of Christ's Spirit, uniting the worthy Communicant here on earth to his Body that is in Heaven? But, heretofore at least, it hath been the common Tenent of the English Divines, to affirm not only a *spiritual* presence, or a presence only by effect, operation, or grace, but a *substantial* presence, in the *Eucharist*, (and that is here on earth, though they commonly hold this presence indeed not to the *Elements*, but to the worthy Receiver), of the very same Body of Christ, that suffered on the Cross, and that is now, at the very same time, as here, so also in heaven.

Would you see some of their Expressions?

☐ To this purpose thus Calvin in 1 Cor. 11. 24.—
Neq; enim mortis sua beneficium nobis offert Christus; sed Corpus ipsum in quo passus est, & resurrexit.—And Institut. l. 4. c. 17. §. 7.—*Neq; enim mihi satisfaciunt, qui dum Communionem cum Christo ostendere volunt, nos spiritus modo participes faciunt, prætèrita carnis, & sanguinis mentione. Quasi verò illa omnia de nihilo dicta forent; carnem ejus vere esse cibum, &c. non habere vitam, nisi qui carnem illam manducaverit, &c.*—§. 9. *Qua omnia non posse aliter effici intelligimus, quin totus [Christus] spiritui, & corpore nobis adhaereat.*

So Dr. Taylor, *Real Presence*, p. 288. pronounceth Anathema to those, who do not confess the *Eucharist* to be the flesh of our Saviour, which flesh suffered for us.—And p. 5. expounds *spiritual Presence* (put in the Title of his Book) only to exclude the

Corporal, and natural manner, [not *spiritual* therefore, so as to exclude *Corpus Domini*; but only the *corporal*, or *natural* manner of that body;] now by excluding the natural manner is not meant (surely), the exclusion of *Nature*, or the *thing* it self; (For then, to say, a thing is there, not after a *natural* manner; were as much as to say; the *thing* is not there;) but, the exclusion of those *Properties*, which usually accompany *Nature*, or the *thing*. And p. 12. he saith—*When the word Real Presence is denied by some Protestants, it is taken for Natural Presence* [which Natural Presence, he well knows, the *Roman Church* also denies]. and not for Presence in rei veritate.

And thus Mr. Hooker, l. 5. § 67. p. 357.—*Wherefore should the world continue still distracted, and rent with so manifold contentions; when there remaineth now no controversie, saving only about the Subject, where Christ is?—Nec doth anything rest doubtful in this; but whether, when the Sacrament is administred, Christ be whole within man only; or else his Body, and Blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated Elements themselves.—And p. 359.—His Body, and his Blood (saith he) are in that very subject, wherunto they minister life, not only by effect, and operation, even as the Influence, &c.*

See also Bishop Andrews Resp. ad Apol. Bell. c. i. p. 11. *Nabis vobiscum de objecto convenit; de modo tu omnis est, &c.—Præsentiam (inquam) credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram. De modo Præsentie nil temere definimus.—non magis quam in Christi incarnatione, &c.* □

§. 67.

Would not one think here; that, touching the *Substantial* (and, may not I say, *corporal*, so it be understood with Dr. Taylor, not after the *natural* manner of bodies) Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, all were agreed? And the question only; (as Hooker) whether it be to, and within, the Receiver only; or also externally seated in the consecrated Elements? And then, though not the deceptions of sense concerning the Bread, yet, (which is much harder,) the many contradictions about the *same* Body, or Entity (if you will), its being at once in diverse places, its being deprived of its dimensions, &c. do not they press in to disturb the Protestant's belief in this matter, as well as the Catholic's? Surely some such thing was considered by the English Synod in Queen Elizabeth's days, 1562. when they both cast out of the 28th of the former Articles of Religion, made in the end of King Edward's Reign, these words following.—[*Cum humana Natura veritas requirat, ut unus, ejusdemq; hominis corpus in multis locis*

locis simul esse non possit, sed in uno aliquo, & definito loco esse oporteat; adeo Christi Corpus in multis & diversis locis, eodem tempore, praesens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacra Litterae, Christus in Caelum fuit sublatu, & ibi usq; ad finem saeculi est perman suru, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus, & sanguinis realem praesentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri. And also cast out a Rubrick, or Declaration to the same purpose, inserted in King Edward's 2d Common-Prayer-Book, which gives this Reason, why no Adoration ought to be done to any real, and essential Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh, and Bloud, in the Eucharist; *because the natural Body, and Bloud, of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not there; it being against the truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at one time in more places, than one; though, (I believe to the great grief, and dislike of many of the true Sons of this Church), the same Rubrick hath gotten in again into the late English Liturgy, But something it is, that the other clause is not, hitherto, readmitted into the Article.*

And, if these Protestants did not discern also some *seeming Absurdities, and Contradictions* in their stating of the Real Presence, why call they the manner *ineffable; full of Miracles; and not apprehensible by reason?*—*Ego hoc Mysterium* saith Calvin || *minime rationis humana modo metior, vel naturalibus sub-* || *Instit. l. 4.*
jectio. Humana rationi minime placebit [that which he affirms] || *c. 17. §. 24.*
penetrare ad nos Christi carnem, ut nobis sit alimentum. Dicimus Christum tam externo Symbolo, quam Spiritu suo, ad nos descendere, ut vere substantia carnis sua animas nostras vivificet.—*In his paucis verbis qui non sentit multa subesse miracula, plusquam stupidus est; quando nihil magis incredibile, quam res toto caeli & terra spatio diffusas, ac remotas, in tanta locorum distantia, non tantum conjungi, sed uniri; ut alimentum percipiant anima ex carne Christi.*—And §. 32.—*Porro de modo, si quis me interroget, scateri non pudebit, sublimius esse arcanum, quam ut vel meo ingenio comprehendendi, vel enarrari verbis, queat.*—And §. 25.—*Captivas tenemus mentes nostras, ne verbulo duntaxat obstreperere; ac humiliamus, ne insurgere audeant.*—And (in his confession of Faith ||)—*Nos fateamur* || *Lib. Ep.*
omnino rationem, quam cum Christo communicamus, ad miraculum p. 572.
referendam esse.

And hence it is that as these Protestants charge the Roman Transubstantiation with contradictions, absurdities, impossibilities; so do the Zuinglians, Remonstrants, Socinians, as freely charge their Real Presence. See the Remonstrants's Apology, c. 23. who thus dispute against them.—*Quomodo enim non credibile*

sed possibile esse, imo quomodo non impossibile, adeoque absurdum videri debet, Corpus Christi quod est & manet in Caelis, & non alibi, vere communicari nobis, qui in terra sumus, & non alibi, ita ut nobis cedat in cibum? — And afterward, p. 251. they say, — *Omnia ista non modo obscura, & incomprehensibilia esse, sed manifeste etiam in se continere, tum vanitatem, tum absurditatem.* — *Et ineffabilia illa mysteria humanam seu curiositatem, seu superstitionem, in hoc tam simplici, tam plano, & a nullo non ingenio facile perceptibili ritu, finxisse potius, quam reperisse;* — *qui postquam a simplici Scriptura phrasi semel discesserunt, admirationibus inexhaustis se pascere malunt, quam clara veritatis scientia.* And the Soci-

|| Volkel. l. 4.
c. 22.

nians accuse this Opinion of the Calvinists, and English Church, — *Eam cum sana mentis ratione pugnare, quæ dicitur fieri non posse, ut Christi Corpus, tanto intervallo a nobis disjunctum, in cœna revera comedamus.* Idcirco & ille, ipse qui sententia istius author est, fateatur se hoc *Mysterium nec mente percipere, nec lingua explicare posse.*

|| Animad.
in Grot.
p. 85.

And thus also Rivet || against it; — *Si Corpus Christi non est in Sacramento quantitative. [i.e.] corporally, or secundum modum corporis] non est omnino; quia Corpus Christi ubicunque est, quantum est, aut non est Corpus.*

Now if it be said here, that though the Real Presence of Protestants, to the worthy Receiver, admits indeed some seeming contradiction: yet doth the Roman Real Presence to the Symbols suffer many more. 1st. I answer, that a Tenent involving one true contradiction, is as far removed from Truth, as that which involves a hundred. And 2^{ly}. That I know no just bounds, but that, if *ineffable, incomprehensible*, may be used for salving three, or four seeming impossibilities, so it may be, for forty.

|| Stil. p. 117
567. — Til-
lotf. p. 275.

As for the Fears suggested by some || — *That, if the judgment of all mens senses is not to be relied on in the matter of the Eucharist, then it will be impossible to give any satisfactory account of the grand Foundations of Christian Faith. For what assurance can be had of any Miracles, &c? Why not the Apostles be deceived in Christ's being risen from the grave? For might it not be an invisible Spirit under the Accidents of Christ's Body? And, since bearing may fail, as well as sight, may not we thus question all Church-Tradition? That nothing is to be admitted by us as certain, which admitted, we can be certain of nothing, &c.* As for such Tragical Consequences, I say they need not much terrifie us.

§. 70.

For 1st. If it be not true in the Eucharist, I suppose it is in another instance; that under the outward accidents, and appearances,

pearances to the senses of one Body was contained the substance, or presence of another; viz. under the external appearance of men, the persons of *Angels*; so that the senses of all men, that looked upon them, were actually mistaken, *Gen.* 18. 19. And so would so many more, as had beheld them. Doth it follow now from this deception of *Sense*, or *Reason* here (which cannot be denied), that, after this, it is impossible to give any satisfactory account of the grand Foundations of Christian Faith; or, that any assurance can be had of *Miracles*, &c. Or lastly, That we can be, thence-forward, certain of nothing? If not; how follows it from the like supernatural Operation supposed in the *Eucharist*? An Argument drawn from our Sences is not, from any of these supernatural effects, deceiving sense, weakened for proving any Truth, save only in so many Particulars, wherein we have, or pretend, *divine Revelation* concerning such deception of our sense. If then there be such *Divine Revelation* for a deception of sense, or natural reason, in the *Eucharist*, I hope all will see these aggravating consequences to be vain. But 2^{dy}. If this *Revelation* be mistaken, yet cannot that deception of sense, which is only believed upon its supposal, be from hence justly extended to any other thing, where a contrary Revelation is not supposed. So that, whether such Revelation be, or be not, *Catholicks*, and the Truth, in such hasty, and unweighed Argumentations, are much wronged. This (from §. 62.) I have annexed, though somewhat besides the design of this Discourse, yet not of that charity which I owe the mispersuaded; that so the reluctances of our *Sense*, or *natural Reason* may do no prejudice to our Faith, and humble submission, (in this great Mystery), to the Traditions of the Church, and Definitions of Councils.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Security in continuing in the Ancient Communion.

That according to the former Concession made in the 5th Chapter, §. 41. there seems to be a great Security to those continuing in the Ancient Communion, §. 71.

As to avoiding Heresy or Schism, §. 72.

As to other grosser Errors, §. 77.

And danger to those deserting is, §. 80.

The Protestants Defence for such Discession, §. 80. n. 2.

The Catholic's Remonstrance, §. 81.

§. 71.

Thus much having been said of the first Concession of Protestants, let us now consider the 2d. (set down §. 41 &c.); their conceding the Western Church before and at the coming of Luther, to have been *Catholic*, and indeficient as to all *Necessaries* and *Essentials* either of *Faith* or *Holiness*.

Now from this (the Catholicness of the Roman Church before Luther as to *Necessaries*) being granted methinks appears a great security, for their Salvation (I mean, as to their *Faith* who are not deficient in an *Holy* life), to all those who persevere to live and die in the external Communion of the present Roman and other Western Churches unreformed: (and then a like hazard to those who relinquish that Communion.)

§. 72.

For 1st, I think it is clear; that none who lived and died in the Faith (that declared in her Councils) and in the Communion of the Western or Roman Church that was before Luthers appearance could endanger his Salvation upon the account of his incurring either *Heresy* or *Schism*: because then the Western or Roman Church before Luther must be held *Heretical*; or *Schismatical*; and so non-Catholic: For these two *Heretical*, and *Catholic* are contra-distinct, (as we have seen above §. 44.), even in the Judgment of Protestants. And, if the Western Church be maintained to have been at that time *Heretical*, then, seeing there was an *holy Catholic Church*, somewhere or other, as in every Age, so in that immediately before Luther, I ask which, and where was it? For the Eastern Churches then used much-what the same publick Liturgy; and were guilty of as gross Errors and Practices; and also they then excluded Non-Conformists from their Communion.

Add

Add to this Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Position || — *That, if we enquire; what was positively believed as necessary to Salvation by the Catholick Church: we shall hardly find any better way, than by the Articles of the ancient Creeds; and the universal opposition of any new Doctrine on its first appearing; and the condemning the Broachers of it for Heresie, in Oecumenical Councils; with the continual disapprobation of those Doctrines by the Christian Churches of all Ages. As is clear in the Cases of Arius, and Pelagius. For it seems very Reasonable (saith he) to judge; that, since the necessary Articles of Faith were all delivered by the Apostles to the Catholick Church; since the foundation of that Church lies in the belief of those things which are necessary; that nothing should be delivered contrary to any necessary Article of Faith, but the Church, by some evident Act, must declare its dislike of it, and its resolution thereby to adhere to that necessary Doctrine which was once delivered to the Saints.* Thus he. From which, thought so reasonable, is gathered the security in adhering to those Tenents, received in the Church before *Luther* (which Tenents Protestants now oppose): Because these are not contrary to any necessary Article of Faith, delivered by the Apostles to the Catholick Church; Not contrary, because Protestants cannot shew (to repeat here the former words) the Broachers of these Tenents, [suppose of a Substantiall Conversion in the Eucharist; Saint-Invocation; Veneration of Images; a Purgatory of Souls after this life; Monastick Vows; Sacrifice of the Mass, &c.] condemned for Heresie in Oecumenical Councils; or a continual disapprobation of those Doctrines by the Christian Churches of all ages (as is clear in the cases of Arius, and Pelagius;) or, the Church by any evident Act, declaring her dislike of them; as may, on the other side, be shewed many evident Acts of her Approbation of them.

And 2^{ly}. If no danger of perishing for Heresie, or Schism, to those living, and dying in this Communion before, then neither can there be to any since *Luther's* times. For if, since these times, this Communion be become Heretical, or Schismatical, I demand, in respect of what Council, or what Definitions, made since *Luther's* days, which it opposeth, is it become Heretical? or in respect of what Church, in deserting or departing from its Communion, Schismatical? Or, in the Protestant's Notions of Heresie, and Schism; in respect of what new Tenent, or Practice against some Fundamental point of Faith, since *Luther's* time, is it become Heretical; when guilty of none such, before? — And, in respect of what new Tyranny, and its unjust exaction of

§. 73.

Rat. Ac-
cunt. p. 58.

§. 74.

of Conformity to what new points of Faith, since *Luther's* time, is it become *Schismatical*; so that one, that could lawfully yield obedience to all those required before *Luther's* appearance, yet cannot, to all the present; or so, that the Church before *Luther* might lawfully require, without hazard of *Schism*, Conformity to its whole Faith, then; and not so the present Church, to the whole, present, Faith? For I hope, none here will have the face to deny Conformity required, by the Western Churches, before *Luther's* coming, to many of the chiefest of those points, wherein Protestants now refuse it. See those points that are mentioned, *Dise.* 3. §. 26.

§. 75.

And you may observe, that the most, or chiefest of the Protestant Controversies, defined, or made *de fide* in the Council of *Trent*, were made so By former Councils of equal obligation; or also were contained in the publick *Liturgies* of the Church Catholick.

As; The Lawfulness of Communion in one kind, declared in the Council of *Constance*. Canon of *Scripture*; *Purgatory*; seven Sacraments; the Pope's Supremacy, in the Council of *Florence*.

Auricular Confession; *Transubstantiation*, in the Council of *Florence*, and the *Lateran*; and *Transubstantiation* also, in five others before it, wherein *Berengarius* his Doctrines were condemned. *Veneration of Images*, in the 2d *Nicene* Council.

Monastick Vows; and *Celibacy of the Clergy*; sufficiently authorized in the four first General Councils. *Adoration of Christ's Body and Blood as present in the Eucharist*,

|| *Capitular*

l. 2. c. 5. -- c.

27.

† *De Spiritu Scabellum*, as it is expounded by S. *Ambrose* †, and S. *Austin*: *Sancta* l. 3. And *Veneration of the Cross* ||, and of *Relicks* in the same Council:

c. 12.

[Only the *Adoration of Images*, allowed by the second *Nicene* Council, indeed is condemned: but this upon a Mistake of the Doctrine of that Council; as is confessed by Dr. *Hammond*, *Treatise of Idolatry*, §. 57. And by Mr. *Thorndike*, *Epil.* l. 3. p. 363. And,

c. 16.

* l. 3. c. 24.

as any one may easily discern, if he will view in the Preface of this *Capitular*, what opinion was imputed by the *Fathers of Frankfort* to those of *Nice*.]

Besides these Councils; *Invocation of Saints*; *Prayers for the Dead*, *Sacrifice of the Mass*, and several other, are apparent in the Publick *Liturgies* of the Church, unaltered (Protestants being Judges) for many Ages preceding the Council of *Trent*; Now the Church obligeth her Subjects to believe all those things lawful, which, in her *Liturgies*, she obligeth them to practise. To all these may be further added,

That

That many of those modern Doctrines and Practices, which the Present Roman Church maintains still against the New Reformers [As A Subordination of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy: The Utility of Prayer for the Dead; and of Invocation of Saints; Veneration of Saints Relicks: Set Fasting-days, Festivals, Vigils: Abstinence from certain Meats; Monastick Vows, Especially, that of Virginity and Celibacy; Hermitages; Disparity of the Celestial Rewards and Degrees of Glory] were also anciently Justified by the Fathers of the Church against Acrius ||, Jovinian †, Vigilantius ||; Who were condemned as Hereticks (i. e. as opposers of those points, that the General Church-practice received, & allowed as lawful) by the same Fathers; and, being crushed by their Censures, were prevented from receiving any further Sentence from a Council. Lastly, Why was there made a departure from the Church, at least for many of these points, before the Council of Trent, if the Church, before, had not made them *de fide*; or required Obedience and Conformity to them; or if the Council of Trent, or Pius the Fourth, were first faulty herein? Suppose then, a belief of some more Points is since added; yet I ask, will the decreeing, or imposing of these infer upon the present Church the guilt of Schism; and not the like decreeing, or imposing the former, infer the same guilt upon the former Church; that, preceding Luther?

Now, from this Identity in Faith, and Practice, in the present Church with that preceding Luther, (excepting, that the Council, held since Luther's time, if our gratitude may be allowed here to speak the truth, hath reformed several practices, in some persons of it, which were before justly blamed) it seems clear, that whoso is a member of the present Western, or Roman Church, may assure Himself that he is a Member of the Church Catholick: For it is impossible, that the Church, which is the same with what was the Church Catholick 150 years ago, should meerly by the difference, and decurrence of time, become non-Catholick. But, if this be still denied, that the present Roman Church is the same for it's Doctrines, and Practices, with that Church which was at Luther's appearing, let the issue of the Contention be placed here, and let search only be made concerning this. Not to ask, mean-while, why Luther reformed, then; why exclaimed so vehemently on the Babylonish Captivity; and founded an Exire de illa Populus meus, if the Deformation of this Church, it's non-Catholickness is only since the Council of Trent; and so not till after his time?

|| Vid. Epi-
phan. Her.
73. -- August
in Her. 53.
† Hieron.
cons. Jovin.
-- Augustin.
Her. 82.
|| Hieronym
contra
Vigilant.
|| See Bishop
Bramhal's
Concession
before, §. 52

§. 76.

§. 77.

gly. As, (I think) here is shewed no danger of perishing in the present external Communion of these Western Churches upon the account of *Heresie*, or *Schism*; so neither is there, on the account of any *gross*, or *grievous Errors*. For, 1st. How are they *grievous Errors*, that are not against any *necessary Point of Faith*? But if they be; such, with Protestants, are *Heresies*. For Example, to name some chief ones. How are *Adoration of the Eucharist*, or, *Invocation of Saints* *grievous Errors*, if also they be not against a necessary point of Faith: viz. this, That *Divine Worship* and *Divine Supplication* (which they say are presented to *Saints*) may be given only to *God*? But then they are *Heresies*. Or, what so *grievous Error* in the present Communion, that was not, (it, or as bad,) in the same Communion before *Luther's* time? When, yet, Christians in this Communion were secure; because, it was then the *Catholick*; and the *Catholick*, being always *Holy*, may err indeed in *superstitions* and *deductions*, and other *by*, and *unnecessary Truths* from *curiosity*, &c. but cannot err from the *Foundation of Faith* (saith the Arch-Bishop) : I add, or of *Good Manners*. These Errors then, which are now charged to render the Church of *Rome* guilty of a manifold *Idolatry*, in her worshipping the *Eucharistical Bread* the *Relicks* and *Images* of *Saints*; and making *Prayers* to *them*, were they not the *same* in the Church before *Luther*, and the *same* their effect?

¶ §. 21. p.
141.

Or, if it be so, that the very same Errors then, light, are now become *grievous*: Upon what account is this, ? Is it, upon a more *evident Conviction* Christians may have now, than heretofore, that such are *Errors*? But what ground can we have to say, that those people do now, *culpably*, and *convincibly*, err in these, who can be accused no more than those before *Luther*, of holding any *Errours*, save such, as are the *Publick Faith* of the Church, (which Church now is authorized as much, as that before *Luther*); and who, to preserve themselves from erring, make use of the securest way, that Reason can imagine, or that Christians are prescribed; whilst, for the sense of the *Scriptures*, that is *controverted* in such Points, they chuse not to rely on their own judgment, but on that of the *supremest Guides* of the Church, and *Judges* of *divine Truth*, that are afforded them here on earth; and so, if they err, yet take the wisest course to have missed erring, that Religion or Reason can dictate? To which *Guides* also all the Subjects of this former *Communion* believe submission of their private judgment to be due, and to be commanded; (which is a very excusable one,

one, if it be an Error) : From whence also it follows, that, till they are convinced of Error in this one Point, of *Submission* not to be due, they are not capable of being convinced in any other point, where it is required : Nay yet further ; to the *Obedience* of which *Guides*, at least for *silence*, and *non-contradiction*, they are obliged, even by the Doctrine of Learned Protestants ||, where-ever these Inferior persons demonstrate the contrary : and such demonstration is a degree of Conviction, surely, that very few can pretend to : And for all, who do not pretend to demonstration (such pretenders, as St. *Austin* saith ||, the Manichees anciently were) Obedience is the surest Ground not to miscarry in the Faith : and this way they take, who still retain the Ancient Communion. || See *Disc.* 3. § 44. || *De milit. credend. c. 1.*

There are two things, for the better securing their liberty of Opinion, and Communion, earnestly maintained by Protestants ||. 1. That, all Particular Churches, or the whole Catholick Church, in some age, or ages, may hold some Tenent, that is an Error, the 2d. That a Separation may be made, without *Schism*, from the External Communion of all-particular Churches, of some age (some of which Churches, or all which, I say must be the Catholick Church of that age) for such Error, if held, or imposed, by these Churches ||. § 78. || *Stillingf.* p. 330. — Archbishop Lawd, §. 21. n. 5.

But then 1st, It is granted by these Protestants : That any such universally held Error can never destroy the *Essence*, or *Being* of the Church Catholick, or render it non-Catholick; because, thus, in such age the Church-Catholick would fail. || See *Stillingf.* p. 331. — *Chillingw.* c. 5. §. 52, 55. § 6, 59.

Now from this I collect my security in holding any Tenents, though they should happen to be Errors, which were universally held in the Church before *Luther*, Because that, as these destroy not the Church it's being still Catholick, so neither do they expell me from still continuing in the bosom of the Church-Catholick. And hence, for example, I am secured ; that I am no *Idolater*, if not swerving from that Church's Doctrines ; because the Church, whilst Catholick, (as she is assumed to be) is not such. But in joining with a Church, that, pretending to reform, holds the contradictories of these former universal Tenents, I am not here secure, but that some of these Tenents may be such Errors, as exclude this new Church from being a part of the Catholick ; and me, if adhering to it, from being a Member thereof ; as the maintaining, by the *Arrians*, and others, of some Tenents contrary

to the universal Doctrines of the former Church, hath separated them from the Church-Catholick. I say, for any *Tenent*, I can shew to have been spread over the whole Catholick Church at *Luther's* appearance, I am secured by Protestants, that in holding this, I am free from *Heresie*, or being rendred thereby extra-Catholick: But then, I am not so, in my entering into a new Society, that contradicts this Church, and such *Tenents*; except this adherence to them should be in such Points, of the truth of which I am infallibly certain: and, what evidence can I have to ground such certainty upon, but that from which the Church Collects the contrary?

§. 79.

2ly. It is granted by them; That these Universal Errors, for which, if imposed, one may lawfully and without *Schism* separate from the Church's Communion, are such wherein the Essence, and Union of the Church-Catholick consisteth not, and so in them she may erre; But, meanwhile, that there are other points that may be imposed, for which a *Separation* cannot be made without *Schism*; viz, such, as constitute the necessary Faith of the Church-Catholick, wherein the errerth not; for so she would cease to be Catholick. Now from hence also I gather: that I, continuing in the external communion of all these Particular Churches, can never be non-Catholick, or guilty of concurring in any *Schism*, for my holding, and conforming to, any of the Church's *universal* Tenents; because none such can destroy the Church from being Catholick still. But, in my separation from all these Churches, imposing such Tenents, I am not secure from *Schism*; because some of these Tenents (as Protestants grant) may possibly be such, as are some part of the necessary Catholick Faith; and so my separation, if made on such account, is *Schism*.

This security then they seem to enjoy, who live, and die in the Communion of the unreformed, Western, or Roman, Church, before, or since *Luther's* times; since they are acquitted thereby from *Heresie*, and *Schism* or any other error damnable to them, who therein follow their spiritual Guides, not against Conscience.

But, the thing which comes next to be considered, I see not how any may promise to himself the like in living, and dying in a *new-raised* Communion, and in deserting the former; especially, if deserting it for any former *general* Doctrines, and Practices thereof; For if such Doctrins and Practices be *not enjoin'd*, he here left to his free liberty, hath no reason, for these, to withdraw himself from the Com-

Communion of the *whole*; But, if they be *enjoyed*, then ought he in these to submit to the judgment of the *whole*: especially so many, as cannot *demonstrate* against them, || ought to submit, I say, at least so far, as, if not to *assent*, yet not to *condemn*. || See *Dissert.* 2. §. 20. —
tradit. All which are transgressed in following the Reformation; where such a person, for the sense of the Scriptures controverted, and for his denying conformity to the doctrines delivered by the Church as matter of Faith, either relies on his own judgment: or, in submitting to a Guide, follows *inferior*, against Superior, Governors, or Synods, or a *Minor*, against a much Major part; Lastly, follows those, who first themselves have refused to follow, or conform to the external Communion, even to the Liturgies and *public Service*, of the *whole* former Catholick-Church, whether *Eastern* or *Western*; and have set up a new one against them of their own, which are all manifest breaches of the unity of the *whole*: I say, I see no *security* any can have in such a new Communion; excepting that, which *invincible ignorance* affords; which, in such an apparent secession from former Churches and Councils, God knows how few, especially of the Learned, that peruse the Writings of former times, it may shelter.

For such a Dissension, and Reformation, The most moderate, and plausible *defence*, which *Protestants*, or (to speak more particularly) which the Church of *England* makes, is this. 1st. That they have a most certain *Rule* of their Faith (common to them with the rest of the Church-Catholick) the *Holy Scriptures*: & besides these, a summary of the same Faith drawn up in the Apostles Creed, and explicated by the *first three Ages*, (i. e. the writings we have thereof) and the *first four General Councils*. And that, in the sincere belief of this primitive *Rule*, so explicated, they rest secure, of believing all that is *necessary for Salvation*; and likewise, of their retaining a firm-Communion, as to the *essentials* of Faith, with the *whole* Catholick-Church, and even with that of *Rome*. 2^{ly}. That the Roman Church is acknowledged by them a Catholick, but not the *whole* Catholick Church. It *one part* only of the Catholick-Church, as also the Church of *England* is *another*. 3^{ly}. That this Roman, or any other, part of the Church-Catholick may *err*, whilst it still remains a part of the Catholick, in *non-fundamentals* or non-essentials, and non-necessaries. 4^{ly}. That this part did *err* in such non-fundamentals, and that grievously; and that the *Protestants*, or Church of *England*, discovered.

§. 80. B. 2.

controverted these to be such grievous errors, by the light of *Scripture*, and testimony of *Antiquity*.

5ly. That this Roman Church added this also to her erring; that she exercised an unlawful dominion, or jurisdiction over the Church of *England*; and required an *assent* from this Church to such her *grievous errors*; upon pain of losing her Communion; Which thing they say, renders Her also truly guilty of *Schism*.

6ly. That the Church of *England* refused such *assent*, or subscription to those points, which by clear Scripture she had discovered to be *Errors*; as in conscience she was bound, though these had been never so *small* ones; nay, though some of them were no Errors, yet if she were perswaded, they were so (it being lawful for none to testify any thing against Conscience); how much more; when so *great* Errors?

7ly. Proceeded, after mature consideration, to *reform* these Errors; but, in her self only, not imposing them upon; or condemning, by reason of them, any other Church for non-Catholic.

8ly. Whertas this her defence proceeds upon supposing the Roman Church, that she left, to be a *part* only, and not the *whole*, Catholic Church; yet that, were it supposed to have been the whole; or their departure to have been from the whole also, as well as from it; that the *whole* though granted in *Fundamentals* infallible, yet may err in *non-fundamentals*, or non-essentially necessities, and that *grievously*; and consequently, if it should require *assent* from its members to such points, in which it is fallible, that they ought not to *assent* thereto, nor to conceal, if it of consequence, when they any way discover, such Error; nay further also, that, (if the General Church neglect it), they may, and ought, for themselves, to *reform* such Error.

§. 81.

But this *Plea* seems easily overthrown, in many of its particulars, by this following *Remonstrance*, often made by the other side.

To the first, The Protestant's having both a certain Rule (the Scriptures,) and a summary of their Faith, (the Apostles Creed &c.) It is replied, That there is a faith of *Agends*, or *Practicals*; (concerning what is lawful, and unlawfully, and what is our duty to do or forbear;) as well as of *speculative* *Credends*, which faith is necessary, and fundamental for attaining salvation; and in which *practical* points also may be, and have been, *Heresies* and *Schisms*. I say; the faith of them necessary, because the *practice* of them is so; which must be grounded

grounded on this faith; that they are lawful, or ought, to be practised.

* That these points are of a much larger extent, than the *speculatives*; and that of *these* we have no Collection, or Summary, drawn up by the Apostles, as we have of the *other*.

† That, as these Protestants say, they do not, for the *speculative* *Credends*, rely on any private sense of the Apostles Creed, or of Scriptures; but profess to believe them according to the Explications made of them by the Church in her first four General Councils, and do place the security of their Faith, for what is the true sense of the Scripture, not on their own judgment, but on their conformity to the judgment of these Councils; so it is all reason that, for the *Practicals* also, they should rely on the Scriptures, only so as these are explicated by the Church in her General Councils.

‡ That, for both these, (*speculatives*, or *practicals*;) as they do, or ought to rely on the Explications of the first four General Councils; (the Truth of which their plea cannot conveniently here be particularly discussed); so, * that they cannot rationally confine their submissions to these alone, but do owe it also to any Councils of the Church following, in any age whatsoever: provided, that these be of equal authority and the latter contradict nothing in the former: To which later Councils new Heresies may give like occasion of further explicating the Articles of our Faith; either in *speculatives*; or *practicals*; as new Heresies did, after three or four hundred years time, to the Explications made by those first Councils; and * that for the *speculative* Articles of the Apostles Creed, particularly that of *the Procession of the Holy Ghost a filio*, the Protestants have submitted to the Explications of Councils after the four first, (and these too, Western Councils only, when the Greek Churches refused to consent to them; and that, as the Greeks say, upon not a verbal, but real diversity in their Faith concerning this *procession*; yet, it seems, the Protestants here prefer'd, and thought fit to adhere rather to, the authority of the Western Churches.) From all which, it follows; that, if the Protestants dissent from the Explications of *such* Councils held in any Age, in either of these, *speculative*, or *practical*, Articles, of their faith, that are necessary (of which necessity, it is fit also, the Council, not they, should judge), they cannot be secure of their retaining all necessary faith, so, as no way to have fallen from it into *Herésie*, or *Schism*: no more, than they will acknowledge, *Arrians*, and *Socinians* secure in their belief of the Apostles Creed, when departing from the Explications of the four first Councils.

And

|| See Bish.
Brambal
Reply to
Chalcedon.
p. 8.—Dr
Field l. 1.
c. 13-1. 2. c. 2.
—D. Hamm
Schism. c. 3.
§. 3. and 9.

And thus is the Protestants *security* of their faith, if any way built or dependent (as they seem here to pretend, it is) on the first Councils, so also devolved on the perpetual conformity to the Decrees of other lawful General Councils, of what Ages soever, in all their Definitions. Again, *“since Schismatics*, (I mean those, that are so in respect to their *spiritual Superiours*; by whom, in a line of subordination, all Catholics are joyned to the Head) as well as *Hereticks*, are not members of the *Catholick Church*; and since all Schism doth not necessarily spring from some difference in the essentials of Religion, (for so none would be *Schismaticks*, but *Arch-Hereticks*) but may arise upon smaller matters, and occasions, || (any, wherein obedience is due); and, the lesser the occasion of it is, the more criminal many times the Schism; therefore there is no security to Protestants in this first Branch of their Defence: that, because they agree with the whole *Catholick Church* in the Essentials of Faith, hence they do still remain in its Communion. This is said to the 1st. From which appears the Contrary to their Conclusion: *viz.* That they neither remain secure, as to their believing all things, that are some way *necessary* to their *Salvation*; Nor, as to their performance of all things necessary to a firm *Communion* with the *Catholick Church*, from their assenting to all things determined within the 3. First Ages, or by the first 4. Councils.

§. 82.

2. To the 2^d, and others following to the 8th; Which consist of 3. main Branches. 1^{ly} Their disceding from, and reforming against, not the *Catholick*, but the *Roman Church*. 2^{ly} Against this Church grievously (though not Fundamentally) erring; 3^{ly} Requiring also their assent to such grievous Errors; it is replied. 1st. That the whole *Catholick Church* of Christ is but *one* body, compacted with a *due subordination* of its members; no less Churches, than Persons, for the preservation of *Truth*, and *Peace*, among them; and the avoiding of *Schism*. 2^{ly}. That the *Church of England* is a member of the *Western Church*, and subordinate to the *Patriarch* thereof the Bishop of the prime Apostolick See joyned with a *Council* composed of this Body. 3^{ly}. That, it being a *part* of this Body, yet this Church, together with the rest of the Protestants, dissented, and departed from the *consenting* judgment, not only of one particular Church, the *Roman*, but of all the other *Occidental Churches*, and the *Western Patriarch* in several points of faith; that are *necessary*, as the other say; but, as themselves confess, that are of *moment*; and

and the failings in which are by them charged on the other side, as grievous errors; which will infer the contrary to be *needful truths*: disceded likewise from their consenting judgments, concerning the Testimony of the Scriptures (rightly understood) and of the Fathers; affirmed by these Churches not to be for, but against them, in the foresaid points.

4ly. Departed both from them, and the most General Councils, that have been held therein, for near this Thousand years. 5ly. And departed from them in several points, wherein the *Eastern Churches* also consented, (and do so still), with these *Occidental Churches*, and their Councils.

6ly. And, upon submission required by this Superior, (not a Collateral,) Authority to these doctrines, departed also from the *external communion*, not only of all the Western, but of the Eastern Churches; even of the whole visible Catholick-Church of that Age, (of which in every Age is said, *Credo unam Sanctam Catholicam, & Apostolicam Ecclesiam*) wherein this discession was made. From the *External Communion* I say, so, as they neither could (nor yet can) communicate with any Church, Eastern, or Western, in their publick worship, and service of God; nor in the participation of the Blessed Sacrament and Communion of the Altar. Neither can this Universal Discession be any way denied: since both the necessity of it, sufficiently appeareth from the modern *Eastern*, and *Roman* Missals, compared; the Masses of *St. Chrysostom*, and *St. Basil*, which (admitting some small variations ||) are the present service of all the Eastern, and Southern Churches, not much differing from the *Roman*; and being, as well as the *Roman*, disallowed by Protestants.

And since also the Discession it self is confessed, both long ago by *Calvin*, lamenting the Protestant's want of Union amongst so many Adversaries || — *A toto mundo discessionem facere coacti sumus*; || *Epist. P. Melancth.* And by *Mr. Chillingworth*, l. 5. §. 55. — *As for the external Communion of the visible Church*, (saith he) *we have without scruple formerly granted, that Protestants did forsake it* (i. e.) *renounce the practice of some Observances, in which the whole visible Church before them did communicate*, (See likewise §. 56. 89). *Did forsake the external Communion of the whole visible Church*, i. e. (as he expounds himself, §. 32). *by refusing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies, & publick Worship of God*; Thus he. And this refusal, surely, was for some Errors extant in this publick Worship; else, why did Protestants also reform this publick Service? And these again such Errors, as were not only held, and used in, but justified, and allowed by, this Church Catholick; and Obedience, and Con-

M

formity

§. 83.

|| See *Cassan*
liturg. c. 9.
And p. 24, &c.|| *Epist. P.*
Melancth.
p. 145.

formity from her Subjects, required thereto : since, if any thing, after the holy Scriptures, be held by this Catholick-Church sacred, and authentick, and by all her Subjects to be embraced, and frequented, her publick *Liturgy*, and the most August *Sacrifice* of the *Altar*, must be so.

What ground therefore of Discession, and what just complaint the Protestants have against the Western Church, excluding them from her Communion, because this Church required something in it, they cannot conform to; the same ground of complaint they have also against the Eastern Churches, as requiring something in their Communion, to which they cannot assent; nor in which, join with them. This for the *external* Communion of the *Oriental*, as well as *Occidental*, Church, that it was forsaken by them, as to God's Publick Worship, and partaking of their Sacraments; And next, as to any other Communion *internal* (mean-while) professed with these *Eastern* Churches in the *Fundamental* Faith, and *Essentials* of Religion, they can pretend none, but that they have (and confess they have) the same Communion with the *Western* Churches too. In what sense therefore they stand separated from the *Roman* Churches, *viz.* in *external* Communion of their publick service of God, and of their receiving with that Church the Blessed Sacrament, they stand separated from the *Eastern* also; and in what sense they still retain the Communion of the *East*, *viz.* in the *Essential*, and *Fundamental* Articles of Faith, they still retain this with *Rome*, as much as them, How is it then, that they say so often, that in their *Reformation* they left the *Roman* Church only not the whole Catholick; numbring the *Greek*; *Russian*, *Abyssine*, and other Churches, as three parts of four; and all these, as on their side, and joined with them? And, to what purpose is the calculating, what proportion the Western Church hath to the whole Catholick; when as their separation, for *Communion external*, is as much from the rest, as it; and both Churches, if any, for this their separation, equally culpable? and when as, for the *internal* Communion, (*i. e.* in all the *Essentials* of Faith) they maintain this no more with the rest of the great Body of the Catholick-Church, than they do with the *Roman*, or *Western* Church?

But here again, if they alledge their farther Union with the *Eastern* Churches, not in *Fundamentals* only, but also in some other Points not *Fundamental*, wherein these Churches oppose the *Roman* (which are but few, and none of them, on the *Greek* side, defined by any former *Superior Council*); among which points is named the *Pope's Supremacy*, and *Infalibility of the Roman Church*. (the

(the latter of these, a thing the *Roman Church*, taken singly, pretendeth not to), yet what will this small accord help ||, as to those || See *Disc.*
 many other points, *defined by Superior Councils* ||, and wherein 3. §. 85. n. 5.
 both East, and West consent; (as those mentioned in the third || See before
Discourse, §. 26. &c ?) In which Points chiefly Protestants are §. 75.
 questioned, for having made, in the *Reformation*, not a secession
 from their Western Mother by ranging themselves to another
 part of the Catholick Church, but a discession from the consenting
 judgment of the whole Catholick.

7ly. Departed from the whole in these points (which were, §. 84.
 at that time, of a general belief, and practice), not only so far
 as to dissent, but also as to contradict, and reform against, them.

8ly. And did all this, (in several of these Controversies),
 upon pretence of the *clearness* of those Scriptures, the *sense* whereof,
 by a much major part of the West, and by the greatest Councils,
 that could for those times be assembled there, (where these Con-
 troversies arose), by the sense also of the Eastern Church con-
 curring in the same Doctrines, and interpretation of Scripture,
 was judged *clear* on the other side.

9ly. Of which Contro-
 versies, and matters in debate, if any were in points necessary; it
 must be granted, that such Councils, being universally accepted
 in such a sense as can only be rationally required ||, in these were || See before
unerrable; and might lawfully require from their Subjects *assent* §. 38.
 thereto; Or at least, if later Councils were faulty in demanding
 their Subjects *assent*; so must be the *four first*; that are allowed by
 Protestants.

10ly. To which Councils also, and not to
 their Subjects, must belong the judgment, of what, or how many
 Points are to be accounted necessary; Or else, neither did the
 judgment hereof belong to the four first Councils, nor could
 they justly upon such a necessity require assent, and join some
 such points to the Creed.

11. But, if such Controversies
 be supposed in non-necessaries; yet, for the peace of the Church, af-
 ter the determination of such a Council, the adverse party ought
 to acquiesce in silence, and non-contradicting, without either pro-
 nouncing that an Error, which such Council holds a Truth; or
 the Scripture clear for such a sense, as such Council disallows:
 which silence had it been kept by Protestants, the Church had still
 remained quiet, and united.

12. Or if Protestants will
 not be obliged to this; why do they still further appeal to a free
General Council, for deciding differences, and settling a peace?
 when they will neither yield the obedience of silence to the De-
 finitions of such Councils, in points not necessary; nor grant, that
 any of the Controversies, concerning which they appeal to them,

are points necessary; wherein such Council, universally-accepted, may be submitted to, by them, as un-errable.

The sum then is; That their *Reformation* was not from some *co-ordinate* Church attempting to tyrannize over them; as the second branch of their defence, and those following to the eighth, do import: but, from *their* Superiors and the whole: From these Superiors, not for something *held*, or *practised*, and not enjoined (for here, since all men have their liberty, was no cause to depart): but for points *defined*, and wherein *Conformity* was required by these Superiors; to whose judgment therefore they ought to have submitted so far, as to learn from it, in matters questioned, what is Truth and Error; Or, at least so far, as not to *contradict* it; and consequently, as, not to *reform against* it: In doing the contrary of which, they are charged as guilty of *Schism*, and of breaking the necessary Laws of *Subordination*, and

|| Of which
see *Disc. 2.*
§. 24. 7. 1.

Unity, established in the Church||: And such Church as justly is absolved from *Schism*, though imposing what perhaps, as their conscience stands informed, they cannot assent or submit to, if the judgment of the Church and of their Superiors is to be preferred by them before their own, as certainly it ought: and the fault will lye not on the Church imposing, but on their non-submission to such injunctions. A thing which the Church of *England* as also freely pleads for herself; when she, in her imposing upon separation from her Communion on *Presbyterians*, and other sects here, several things to which such cannot in their conscience assent or submit to, is by these accused as hereby guilty of the *Schism*; in the same manner, as herself useth to charge the Church of *Rome*.

3. To the 8th. wherein they further affirm, that the whole Catholick Church of some Age may fall into (though not Fundamental, yet) grievous Errors: Of which Errors therefore, a *Reformation* may be necessary; the things said, but now may be repeated. That as to any necessary Truth the Catholick Church can never err in defining any thing against it. That as to any Unnecessary Truth, if she should err in her definition, and Subjects could some way certainly discover this Error; yet, here, their Duty obligeth them at least to silence, and non-Contradiction. That whosoever the Error is *Grievous*, the contrary Truth, in the Church's sense, is accounted *necessary* and so she, in such point, free from error; and that, for what is necessary, or otherwise, Subjects are to learn this from the Church. That no Subject can have a Demonstrable certainty, that any thing is an Error which the Church-Catholick defines, and imposeth to be believed,

|| *Disc. 2.*
§. 10.

believed, as a Truth; And that Christian Humility teacheth Inferiours and Subjects a contrary Lesson to such gross *Self-conceit*.

4. Lastly, whereas, against such Obedience, an Obligation is pleaded (n. 6.) to do nothing against Conscience; It is replied, that a man's conscience miss-perswaded that something is an Error, is to be followed indeed; and he, upon no command, to profess assent thereto against it; but it excuseth not from guilt, nor freeth from the Church's Censures those, who might have better informed it ||.

|| See Dr.

Thus the Remonstrance. After which well weighed, I see *Hammond* not, what security any one can have in continuing in such a Society, as hath thus broken the Links of Ecclesiastical Government, c. 4. §. 8. & lives in a separation from the main Body; if either the rejecting the *Definitions* of the Church's former Councils be *Heresie*; or relinquishing her *Communion*, *Schism*. And so I leave this matter to the Consideration of all Serious Christians, whom it may concern: Humbly Beseeching the God of Unity and Peace that we may all live and die Sons of his Holy Catholick-Church, and happy Partakers of her Holy Sacraments, Prayers, and Benediction.

The End of the First Discourse.

THE



THE SECOND DISCOURSE.

Proceeding (upon the Concessions of Learned Protestants, that the Pastors of the Church, some or other, in all Ages, do guide their Subjects infallibly in Necessaries) to search which, in any Division happening among these Pastors, are those, to whom Christians ought to adhere, and yield their Obedience.

CHAP. I.

Concerning these Guides, Some Concessions of Learned Protestants.

Protestants assenting.

1. *That there is, at this present, an One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick Church, §. 1.*

2. *That the present Pastors and Governors thereof have Authority to decide Controversies, §. 2.*

3. *And that these Governors shall never err or mis-guide Christians, at least in absolute Necessaries, §. 3.*

4. *And that they, with the Church governed by them, do stand always distinct from Heretical, and Schismatical, Congregations, §. 5.*

1st.



That there is an, One, Holy, Catholick, Apostolick, Church, in this Age, at this present time; All, I suppose, grant. §. 1. Proposition 1.

2ly, That this present Church (that is, in its Pastors, and Governors) is appointed for a Guide to Christians, and hath Authority to decide Controversies, is unquestioned also among several. §. 2. Proposition 2.

|| See *Disc.* 1. §. 22. &c. veral learned Protestants || ; And, I think, is a part of the 20th. Article of the Church of England : which Article saith, *The Church hath Authority in Controversies of Faith*, [And what Authority can it mean, but for deciding them ? or who decide them, but the Ecclesiastical Governors ?

6. 3.
Prop. 3.

3ly, *That these present Governors, in this present Age, either* *collectively taken, *as they are assembled in a Council, the Decrees whereof are universally accepted by those Governors of the Church diffusive, that are absens from it ; or* *disjunctively taken, *for some visible Society, or other, of them at least, (sometimes lesser, sometimes greater), shall never misguide Christians. at least in absolute Necessaries to salvation, is also acknowledged by learned*

|| See *Disc.* ned Protestants ||.

1. §. 15. &c.

And seems to be the clear sense of the 19th. Article of the Church of England, which affirms—*'The visible Church of Christ to be a Congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached,* [preached, I suppose by its Ministers ||] *in all these things, that of Necessity are requisite to the same* [Church, or Congregation of the faithfull.] And indeed, otherwise, either the first Proposition || (a part of our Creed) would be false ; because, since the people are obliged to the faith of these their Governors, (*Heb. 13. 7.—Eph. 4. 11. compared with 14.*) the whole Church would thus err in Necessaries, and so would cease to be *Catholick* : Or, at least the *Catholick-Church*, in such a deficiency of the Clergy, would be constituted wholly of *Laicks*, and of Christs *Sheep* without Pastors ; save those, whose Sacraments, and Communion, by their falling away from the *Catholick-Church* in Fundamentals, are become unlawful : which seems very absurd, and contrary to the Promises of our Lord.

|| See Art. 23.

|| §. I.

Concerning this visible Church, or Society of *Orthodox-Guides* thereof, never deficient, See the Concessions of Dr. Field, Dr. Ferne, Mr. Hooker, and other learned Protestants, in 1. *Disc.* §. 25. || &c. And M. *Chillingworth*, though, by reason of the plainness of *Scriptures* in all *Necessaries*, he acknowledgeth no need of any such *Guide*, and therefore denies it || : yet thus he freely speaks of the necessity of the *Infallibility* of such *Guide*, if once supposed. || In *Civil Controversies* (saith he) *we are obliged only to external passive obedience, and not to an internal, and active. We are bound to obey the sentence of the Judge, or not to resist it ; but not always to believe it just. But, in matters of Religion, such a Judge is required, whom we should be obliged to believe to have judged right.*

|| See *Disc.* 1. §. 3.

|| P. 59.

right. So that in Civil Controversies every honest understanding man is fit to be a Judge : But in Religion none, but he that is infallible. Thus he. And the reason seems plain ; because these are Guides of our souls, and consciences in matters of belief for attaining our Salvation ; but so are not the secular, whether our *natural*, or *civil*, Governours, (so that the usual arguing of some Protestants, from the *fallible* authority of the one, its being *sufficient* for deciding Controversies to that of the other, seems very faulty) ; since we have to these no obligation, as concerning *divine matters*, either to *assent* to what they purpose, or to *practise* what they command, further, than we believe the thing *true*, they propose, and *lawful*, they command ; but are, in case of any doubt in these matters, from their Courts to repair to these our *spiritual Guides* to be directed, what is *truth*, and *err* ; *lawfull*, and *unlawful*. The judgment and decision of which things, (so often as the true meaning, and sense of the divine law falls into controversy) those, who do not give to these *Church-Guides*, do, much more dangerously, both for their own souls and the state they live in, not offer to the Governours of the State, but take to *themselves* ; for neither do these give the decision of such things to the Civil Magistrates.

4. Again; It follows likewise from the present being of the Catholick Church of every age; which is supposed to consist as well of *Clergy* as *People*; That the present *Governors* or *Guides* thereof, who, or whereever they be, cannot in any age be Heretical, or Schismatical; for all *Heretical*, or *Schismatical* *Congregations* are *contra-distinct* both to [*Holy Church*] and [*Catholick Church*], mentioned in our *Creed*.

This is a thing conceded by Archbishop *Lawd*, D.*Field*, Bishop *Bramball*, and others. See *Disc.* I. §. 37, 44.

CHAP. II.

Further Assertions of Roman Catholics.

4. *Catholicks further, affirming,*
5. *That if these Pastors be infallible in Necessaries, the people are to learn from them, what is necessary, §.6.*
6. *That this their Infallibility in Necessaries must extend not only to some few points absolutely necessary, but all others very beneficial, to Salvation, §.9.*
7. *That it is no way requisite, That these Church-Guides should exact-*

ty distinguish all such *Necessaries* from other points not so, §. 12. Which they may, infallibly guide in, though they do not infallibly separate, §. 14. And, when no distinction of these is made, ought to be believed in all they propose, §. 15. Yet, that they do both distinguish, and propose as such, all those more necessary points which it is requisite for all Christians more particularly, and explicitly to believe, §. 17.

8. That Christians, if submitting to their Judgment in deciding *Necessaries*, ought also to submit to the same, in their declaring the sense of Fathers, Definitions of Councils, &c. touching the same matters, §. 19.

9. That, supposing these Guides to erre in some of their Decisions, yet (even by the Concession of Learned Protestants) their Subjects ought to yield Obedience, either of Silence, or also of Assent, to them in all such points, whereof they cannot demonstratively prove the contrary, §. 20.

10. Whence it follows; That, none may adhere to any new Guides, save only those persons, who can demonstrate the Errors of the former, §. 21.

§. 6.
Prop. 5.

These things agreed on, *g*ly, Catholicks proceed; That, if there shall be always such a Body of Church-Governours, as shall direct the people unerringly in *Necessaries*, it is meet also, that Christians learn from them, what, or how many, points they be, that are necessary (if this thing be at all necessary to be known;).

§. 7.

The Reason. 1. Because, if the Church-Guides be infallible in *Necessaries*; and the distinct knowledge of *Necessaries* be held also a *Point necessary*, then the Church-Guides must also be infallible in this point, the discerning of *Necessaries*. 2ly. Because (though Divine assistance be set aside) these Guides, from their Learning, are fitter Judges of *Necessaries*, than the People, 3ly, Because the People, in their judging of *Necessaries*, if they should (ignorantly, or passionately) mistake something, that is necessary, not to be so; and so withdraw their Obedience, or assent, may thus become deficient in necessary Faith, and so miscarry in their Salvation: Whereas, on the other side, in their reliance, for these points, on the judgment of their Guides, (that are infallible in *necessaries*), in *necessaries* they cannot miscarry; and, in their believing something more, as necessary, which is not, their miscarriage is no way dangerous. For, as Dr. Potter well observes—||: There is not so much danger in adding superfluities, as in detracting *Necessaries*, and though these Church-Guides should be

be supposed liable to miscarry sometimes in the first, yet Christians are secured, that they cannot, in the second.

Of the Duty of the Christian's learning, from their Guides (supposed infallible in Necessaries), what points are necessary, thus Mr. *Chillingworth* || -- If the Church be an infallible director in Fundamentals, then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her, but also learn of her, what is Fundamental [i.e. if this be a thing necessary to be learn'd]; and, take all for fundamental, which she delivers to be such. [i.e. lest, in doing otherwise, we should mistake, and miscarry in some Fundamental.] And p. 105. To say, the Church is an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, were to oblige our selves to find some certain Society of men, of whom we might be certain, that they neither do, nor can, err in Fundamentals, nor in declaring what is fundamental, what is not fundamental; and consequently, to make any Church an infallible Guide in Fundamentals, would be to make it infallible in all things, which she proposes, and requires to be believed. [i.e. that she may require our Assent, and Belief of all things she proposeth, by the device of her proposing them as necessary.]

§. 8.

|| p. 150.

6ly. When the Church-Guides are said to be infallible in Necessaries, Catholicks contend; That, Necessaries* ought not to be taken here in so strict a sense, as to be restrained, and limited only to those few points of Faith, that are so indispensably required to be of all men explicitly believed, as that Salvation is not possibly consistible with the disbelief, or ignorance, of any of them; which are thought by the Learned to be only some few Articles of the Apostles Creed. [Of which see Dr. Potter, §. 7. p. 242. &c.] But* ought to be understood in a sense more enlarged, comprehending, at least, * all such Points, as are so requisite, and beneficial to Salvation, as that there is (considering the times) some danger of a miscarriage therein; either in respect of Faith, or Manners, either to Particulars, or to the whole Society; either to all, or at least to some persons, and conditions of men, by the ignorance, or disbelief, of them; * all such points, as corroborate Fundamentals by their near connexion to them; or, as serve to repel the malignant Influence of some Error, that either directly, or by some consequence at least, undermines, and corrupts, or (to use the Archbishop's words ||) grates upon, or miss-expounds, some Fundamental, either in the Christian Faith, or Manners.

§. 9.

Prop. 6.

|| §. 35. n. 5, 6

The Reason is. Because our Saviour's Promised assistance of his Church is not expressly limited to Necessaries in the first settle, by any of those Texts that mention it; nor can, upon

§. 10.

I.

- any account of the superfluouſneſs, or non-neceſſity of ſuch aſſiſtance, be denied to the Church, in reſpect of neceſſaries in the ſecond ſenſe, whereever any Error in ſuch Points (though they be not principles, or Fundamentals, but Deductions, and Superſtructions) appears to be *groſs, dangerous, damnable, blaſphemous, idololaſtrical, grating the Foundation, &c*; which ſort of Errors, Proteſtants grant, there may be in *non-fundamentals*; and, by them are ſuch Errors charged upon the *Church of Rome*; but it ſeems unſutable to our Lord's Love, and everlaſting protection of his deareſt Spouſe, that they ſhould be alſo incident to the *Church Catholick*, or its *ſupreme Guides*. 2ly. Becauſe the *Practice* of the generally-allowed Primitive Councils defining, & under *Anathema* impoſing the belief of, many ſeveral Points of Faith, which fall not under the *firſt* notion of Neceſſaries, doth ſhew; that Church-tradition hath alwaies underſtood Chriſt's Promiſes, made to the Church, as extending to Neceſſaries in the *ſecond* acception. Neither will infallible aſſiſtance in neceſſaries, as they are taken in the firſt ſenſe, extend to the *Church-definitions* made in the points delivered in the *Athanaſian Creed*; which points yet the Church hath defined as *neceſſary*, and *infallible*. Again; ſince it is affirmed by Proteſtants, that a *Lawful General Council*, accepted by the whole Catholick Church diffuſive, may err in *non-neceſſaries* (for ſo, ſay they, may the whole Catholick Church diffuſive err), if then the Church-definitions, found in the *Athanaſian Creed*, are alſo to be reckoned ſuch, *i. e. non-neceſſaries*, upon what account can Proteſtants firmly believe them for *true*, (except ſo many perſons only as are able to demonſtrate them out of the Scripture,) ſeeing they are deprived of any confidence of the *Church's* not erring therein; as being points reckoned non-neceſſaries? And, the Promiſes thus reſtrained to Neceſſaries of the *firſt* kind only, what an hurtful liberty is there left to all *Sects*, to queſtion the Church's Infallibility in many Principal Articles of her faith; as (for example) to the *Socinians*, to queſtion it in the point of *Conſubſtanti- lity*, under this pretence of the Church's poſſibility of erring in non-neceſſaries? 3ly. Becauſe I ſee not, how the title of *Holy*, which is continued for ever to the Church-Catholick by the promiſe of our Lord, can conſiſt with all thoſe Errours, that yet do oppugn Neceſſaries, only as taken in the ſecond, not firſt, notion: called *groſs, dangerous, damnable, blaſphemous, &c*; if, as theſe are imputed to the *Roman Church*, ſo they may happen, notwithstanding ſuch promiſes, to the *Catholicks*. If her *doctrines* (and conſequently *practices*) be ſometimes damnable, blaſphemous, &c. how *She* always *Holy*? 4. Becauſe, by the ſame *divine aſſiſtance*, the Catho-

[Arch-biſh.

Lawd, §: 37

n. 5, 6.

—Art. of

Rel. 31.

---Chilling.

p. 119.

2.

—Stilling

p. 230.

[See Arch-

biſh. Lawd,

p. 139, 140,

141.

Catholick Church is affirmed by Protestants never to fall into *Heresie*; which thing also infers a divine assistance thereof beyond Necessaries in the first notion, unless Protestants will affirm the contradictories of several of the Church-definitions, that are delivered in the *Athanasian Creed*, or the first allowed G. Councils, not to be *heresies*.

§ly. Two reasons Protestants usually give, why our Lords Promise of the G. Church's non-erring is to be restrained only to *some*, and not enlarged to *all* Truths; The first is, * *because they are by and unnecessary Truths, to which her curiosity or weakness may carry her beyond her Rule, &c.* || * *because they are such* || Arch-bishop Lawd¹
Points, as may be variously held, and disputed without hurt or prejudice to faith—* *because they are unprofitable curiosities, and unnecessary subtilties, for which the Promise was not made*—* *because,* p. 141.
Deus non abundat in superfluis || : *As nature, so God is not lavish in* || Dr. Potter
superfluities : Therefore, here, what points, though not Necessaries p. 5. p. 150.
ries; and are, though not *absolutely*, yet very, necessary still, thus, &c.
 far in these we may suppose our Lords assistance continued, to his Church, preserving her from failing in them. The second reason, which Protestants also give, why the Church cannot err in *fundamentals*, is, the prespicuity of Scriptures in these points.—
This power of not erring (saith the Arch-bishop ||) *is in the Church,* || p. 1. Co.
partly by the virtue of this Promise of Christ; and partly by the matter which it teacheth; which is the unerring Word of God so plainly and manifestly delivered to her, as that it is not possible; she should universally fall from it, or teach against it in things absolutely necessary to salvation. But doubtless many more points there are, as plainly delivered in Scripture, as those Necessaries of the first rank; and therefore no reason, to confine the Church's unerring verdict only to these. And, if more points then the Primary fundamentals were not clear in Scripture, how come Protestants, in several of them, on this account of their clearnesse in Scriptures, to oppose, and contradict, the *Supreme Guides* of the Church? Hitherto the sixth Proposition or Assertion of Catholicks concerning the due extent of Necessaries.

7ly. Concerning the Church-Governours their exact distinguishing of Fundamentals, or Necessaries, from non-Necessaries, (a subject of much contention.)

1st, There seems no greater necessity, * *that these Church-Governors should be enabled exactly to distinguish these, in all particulars* : Or * *that Catholicks should learn such distinction from their Governours; than that Protestants should learn it from the Scrip-*

tures.

§. 12.

Prop. 7.

1.

pieces. And the Answer, which Protestants give, for a non-necessity of this latter, viz. [Because who believes all the Scripture, say they, believes all Necessaries revealed in it]; they may take for a non-necessity of the other; because who believeth all that the Church defineth, believeth all Necessaries defined by it]; Neither again can the Protestants justly require any certainty, explicitness, or distinction of faith, concerning the Proposals of the Church, which distinction, &c. themselves do not maintain, or think necessary, concerning the Proposals, and sense of Scripture.

So, if the Protestant Divines grant a sufficient certainty (as they do) in a Christian's faith, who believes all Fundamentals from or upon the Authority of Scripture; though, mean-while, he knows not, from the same Scriptures, which, or how many they are; and though neither the Protestant Guides, nor their followers, can out of these Scriptures, make any certain catalogue of them; and though these Guides also may, in the sense of many Texts of Scriptures, err, and mistake; (so that Protestants only build a sufficiency of their faith upon this hypothetical certainty; that, if the point be necessary, they, using a due industry, cannot err in the sense of such Scriptures, as deliver it; because all necessities God hath, in these Scriptures, clearly revealed); Then they cannot deny the same sufficient certainty of a Catholic's faith, that believes all fundamentals from the Proposal of his Ecclesiastical Guides, if these Guides be granted in these infallible; though, neither he, nor these Guides, should certainly know, for all points, which, or how many these fundamentals be.

§. 13.

Very vain therefore seems that discourse of Mr. Chillingworth c. 3. §. 57. so far as it is made use of to this purpose; to shew upon the Church-Guide's not distinguishing of fundamentals, or the supposed liability of these Church-Guides to err in non-fundamentals, the uncertainty or insufficiency of a Catholic's faith: As also ridiculous that arguing of his; where, when Catholics say, they are certain, concerning every particular point proposed by the Church, that, if it be a fundamental, she errs not in it [i.e. errs not, in what she determines concerning it; or errs not, in her determining any thing against it] He mistakes them to say, that they are certain, that if it be a fundamental truth, the Church doth not err in it [i.e. in holding it]; which (saith he) is to plain English to say; you are certain, it is true; if it be both true, and

§. 14.

2.

necessary. And such is the way, which the Church-Guides, when being supposed to err, follow in distinguishing Necessaries from non-Necessaries; that therefore they are not an infallible Guide in all Necessaries that

that is, in teaching, and prescribing them; though they should not be so, in distinguishing them, and in their teaching nothing, besides, together with, them.

Nor is that consequence of Mr. Chillingworth's || true, That if there be a Society of men infallible in Fundamentals; they must be so || p. 105, also, in declaring what is Fundamental, or necessary, what not; unless upon this supposition, that the declaring thereof is also a thing Necessary (as I suppose he meant it.) For I may be certainly, by the divine goodness, preserved from error in many truths, which yet I do not certainly know, that they are truths; And again further; may certainly know something to be a truth and teach it to others; and yet not further know it to be a truth so absolutely necessary, as perhaps it is. To use Mr. Chillingworth's simile || p. 159. A Physician, in his using of a medicine consisting of twenty Ingredients, of which medicine he is certain, that the whole recet haibin it all things necessary to the cure of such a disease, yet may not exactly know, whether all the Ingredients thereof are absolutely necessary, or only some of them necessary, the rest only profitable, and requisite ad melius esse; or some only necessary, some profitable, and the rest superfluous, yet not hurtful; As also the Protestants grant, that the Church, in delivering the Scriptures, delivers all necessary truths therein, yet without her punctually knowing what or how many they are.

3ly. It seems most reasonable; that a Guide, of whose not erring in Necessaries, I am secure, But neither I, n.r. it, can exactly distinguish such from non-Necessaries, should be believed by me in all it proposeth, though in some Proposals it should be liable to error.

I must add one exception indeed: unless in some particular, which it proposeth, I am infallibly certain of the contrary; for then, in such points I am sure, that the Tenent of this Guide can be no fundamental Truth, because, not truth. But 1st, this Exception is unserviceable to all those persons (which are the most) as can plead no such infallible certainty; for so many stand obliged still to the former belief. 2ly, such exception can, rationally, be made use of by none, in the matters we speak of; for who can presume himself thus certain in a matter of faith, or in his own sense of Scripture, (though the literal expression be never so clear), where so many learned, and his Superiors, (comparing other texts, &c.) understand it otherwise, and are of a contrary judgment? For, it is the same, as if, in a matter of sense, a dim-sighted person should profess himself certain, that an object is white, when a multitude of others, the most clear-sighted that can be found, having all the same means of a right sensation as he hath,

hath, pronounce it black, or of another colour. see *Disc. 4. §. 11, 12.*

§. 16.

Now, this case only excepted, I say, such Guide ought to be believed by me in all it proposeth. And this upon a triple account. 1st, because otherwise I expose my self to error in something necessary; to which error, in not following this Guide, I am very liable; for, though I have, besides this Guide, a *Rule* infallible; yet my *sense* thereof is not so, in points that are controverted. 2^{ly}, because this is such a Guide, as learned-Protestants grant, that Gods Command doth oblige me, to obey its judgment, where I have no *certain evidence* of the *contrary* to its decrees ||.

|| See below

§. 20.

And also *common reason* obligeth me to follow a *better* judgment, than my own; especially, when I do it, as with due humility, so with sufficient safety, as here; because thus the point must be only a *non-necessary*, that I can err in: and as I am certain, if the point be a *fundamental*, that it is *true*, what this Guide delivers; so not certain, if it be no fundamental, that then it is not true. 3^{ly}, because, though something superfluous may possibly be determined by this Guide, yet, considering the former notion of *Necessaries* ||, (to which, there seems good cause, that the infallibility of this Guide be extended), who will undertake to exclude any *particular* Church-definition from being, in some of the fore-named respects, *necessary*? especially, when he must do this against better Judgments, whilst these Guides, consulted about any particular decrees of theirs, will never profess, or grant to him, to have passed it, but as thought, in respect of some times, places, or persons; in respect of Christian faith, or manners, edification of particulars, or Government of the Church, *necessary*. This concerning the reasonableness of believing in *all points* those, who are infallible in *all points Necessary*.

|| §. 9.

§. 17.

4.

4^{ly}, Though these *Church-Guides* should be granted not to be enabled, by the *divine assistance*, so far; as to distinguish *exactly* *Necessaries*, from non-*Necessaries* in *all points*, so that nothing should be redundant in their definitions, or proposals: Yet it seems rationally concluded, *That they are always so far divinely assisted, not only in their decisions, not to err in Necessaries; but also, in their Judgment, to discern, and distinguish them from other points, that are not necessary to be so much pressed; and, in their diligence, to propose them; as that they shall never fail in the discerning, or proposing (in their Creeds, Catechisms, and other publick teachings) all more absolute necessities, or all points requisite to be explicitly believed; (for all things defined are not necessary to be by all men known, or to all men taught); never fail in proposing these,*

these, I say, so clearly and entirely to all the Subjects of the Church, even the unlearned, as that none can be ignorant thereof, without his neglect to hearken to such a sufficient Proposal, which is, in all times, made by the Church.

The Reason of this Inadequacy of Church-Guides in the Proposal of such Necessaries, is: Because it seems most just, and is on all sides accorded, that all Necessaries, wherein an explicit faith is required of all Christians, should be to them, by some means or other, sufficiently proposed. And then, the dispute, concerning this sufficient Proponent, lying between the Scriptures, and the Church, (for what other external Proponent can be devised?) of these two, as to several of these Points, the latter must be it for these Reasons. 1st, Because experience shews, the

sense of Scripture not evident to all men in many great Articles of faith; which Articles yet are cleared to them by the Church-Guides|| So that, though it be true, which Mr. Chillingworth

saith||, That he who believes all that is Scripture, believes all Necessaries: yet so it is, that in many places of Scripture, and that a-

bout points thought necessary, when these places are variously interpreted, many (unlearned especially) know not what to believe, as, or for, the Scripture-sense in such places; and thus they fail in the explicit belief, * of some part of Scripture; and so per-

haps, * of some Necessaries in it. 2^{ly}, Because so it was, that, before the penning of the New Testament-Scriptures, this office of the Proposal of all divine necessary truths to the people, belonged to the Church-Guides, to Timothy, Titus, and others: Nor seems their authority, by the writing of the Christian faith, diminished; by which Writings also they are still more enabled compleatly to perform their former duty. 3^{ly}, Because these Scriptures also refer us, in controversies, and in learning our faith, to the direction of these Guides. See §.3. 4^{ly}, Because the illiterate within the Church-Catholick, to whom also God is not to be thought deficient in the revelation of all necessary faith, cannot have this from Writings; but must receive it from their Guides, and Pastors: as also they did in all those times before Christ, when the Holy Scriptures remained only in the hands of the learned; or also, before any of them were penned. This, of the Church-Guides distinguishing Necessaries from non-Necessaries.

8^{ly}. If we ought to submit our judgments to these present Guides, in their deciding what are necessary matters of Faith, according to the Fifth Proposition preceding||; it seems reasonable, that so we ought also to submit * in their expounding all former Writings

164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745.

Writings concerning the same matters, that are pretended any way ambiguous, and so cannot end the Controversie, that is made about their sense; whether these be the Writings of the Scriptures, or of the Fathers, or of the former Councils of the Church. And also * in their declaring which of former Councils are Legal, and Obligatory.

So that the ultimate determination of doubts, as concerning new questions, so concerning all former Determinations, and Definitions of former Church, in such matters of necessary Faith, when Controversie is raised touching such Judgment of former Church, ought to be referred to these present Judges; and their determinations hereupon, so far as we can have them, to be peaceably acquiesced in. For, if we ought to receive all, that they deliver to us as matters of necessary Faith, we ought also, and may as securely, credit them, when declaring what in these Necessaries, was the Faith of their Predecessors; or in what sense their words, that deliver the traditive and true doctrine, are to be taken.

§. 20.
Prop. 9.

oly. Protestants also agree: That, though these Guides may erre in some Points not necessary, yet their Subjects ought to yield their silence, and by no means to contradict them; or (as some more judicious Protestants do yield yet further) ought to submit their Judgments also, and yield their Assent to them, (even in those Definitions, wherein these Guides are liable to Error) whenever (not these Guides do prove to them their Conclusions; so much is thought unreasonably exacted, but) their Subjects cannot demonstratively prove the contrary.

In this matter thus Dr. Jackson, in stating the Question: whether the Injunction of publick Ecclesiastical authority may over-
* versway any degree of our private perswasion, concerning the unlawfulness of any Opinion, or action || — It is most evident

|| On the
Creed, l. 2.

§. I. c. 5.

† Ibid. c. 6.

|| Eph. 4. 11.

Heb. 13. 17.

Luk. 10. 16.

Joh. 20. 23.

Ib. c. 4.

|| p. 175.

[faith be], from the Texts formerly alledged by him || concerning the Commission of Priests, and Ministers] that the Lawful Pastor, or Spiritual Overseer, hath as absolute authority to demand Belief, or Obedience, in Christ's; as any Civil Magistrate hath to demand Temporal Obedience, in the State, or Prince's Name. — And Ibid. || — Superiours (saith he) are to be obeyed in such points as their Inferiours are not at leisure to examine, or not of capacity to discern; or not of power or place to determine, whether they be lawful, or no.

Again, Ibid. p. 174. — True spiritual obedience, were it rightly placed in our hearts, would binde us rather to take well of the things commanded for authorities sake, than to disobey authority for the private dislike of them. Both our disobedience [i.e. dissent, or non-
subordination of Judgment] to the one, and dislike of the other, are unwarrantable.

narrantable, unless we can truly derive them from some formal contradiction or opposition between the publick or general Injunction of Superiours, and express Law of the Most High. And e. 4. p. 165. — Sundry (saith he) in Profession Protestants, in eagerness of opposition to the Papists, affirm; that the Church, or Spiritual Pastors must then only be believed, then only be obeyed, when they give sentence according to the evident and express Law of God, made evident to the heart and consciences of such as must believe and obey them. And this, in one word, is to take away all authority of Spiritual Pastors, and to deprive them of all obedience, Unto whom doubtless God, by his written Word, hath given some speciall authority and Right to exact some peculiar obedience of their Flock. Now if the Pastor be then only to be obeyed, when he brings evident Commission out of the Scripture for those particulars, unto which he demands belief or obedience, what obedience do men perform unto him more than to any other man whomsoever? For whosoever he be that can shew us the express undoubted command of God, it must be obeyed of all: But whilst it is thus obeyed, It only, not he, that sheweth it unto us, is obeyed. And if this were all the obedience, that I owe unto others I were no more bound to believe or obey any other man, than he is bound to obey, or believe, me: the Flock no more bound to obey the Pastors, then the Pastors, them. Yet certainly God who hath set Kingdoms in Order, is not the Author of such confusion in the Spiritual Regiment of his Church. This He, this others. See Confid. on Council. of Trent. 9. 295. And in reason what can any say less?

101. From this I also take it for granted; That, §. 21.
though such or so many, as can demonstratively prove the contrary, Prop. 10.
are hereby disobliged to yield their Assent to the Decrees of their former Guides: yet so many others as cannot do the like, remain obliged still to follow, and obey the same, their former, Pastors; and by no means may join themselves in communion, or adhere, to the new Demonstrators, till they themselves are confirmed in the like Certainty. By which Rule, how few of the Reformed will there be, that do not still owe their Obedience to the same Church (giving her Laws still as formerly), that was before Luther, (who upon pretended new Evidences deserted it), to which Church it is granted all owe this Obedience, save only the Demonstrators of their new Tenents?

102. CHAR.

CHAP. III.

The Rule whereby to discern our true Ecclesiastical Guide.

11. That these Church-Governours may teach diversly, and some of them err in Necessaries, and fall into Heresies, §. 22.

12. And therefore Christians not permitted to follow, whom of them they please: But some certain Rule there is, to which of them, in any Division, they ought to adhere. That this Rule, according to the universal Church-practice, is, and rationally can be, no other than, in these Judges subordinate dissenting, to adhere to the Superior; in those of the same Order, and Dignity, dissenting, to the Major part, §. 23. &c.

Where, Of the Major part concluding the whole, in the ancient Councils, §. 25. n. 2.

And, Of the Defection of the Church-Prelacy in the times of Arrianism, §. 26. n. 2.

13. That the Protestant-Marks, whereby to discern true from false Guides, as to the Quest here (viz. to learn from these true Guides, which, in matters controverted, is the true Faith,) are unserviceable, §. 28.

§. 22.
Prop. 11.

11ly. **T**hat some of these Church-Governours (more, or fewer) may become Hereticks, and erroneous in points necessary; and may guide Christians contrary to the rest of them, is granted by all sides, and known by Experience.

§. 23.
Prop. 12.

12ly. It seems therefore also evident: That, Christians, (for yielding the Obediences, forenamed Propos. 9th. and allowed by Protestants) in such dissenting of Governours, may not safely follow, which of them they please, or judge to be, in their doctrines, the rightest; (for so they judge of their Judges, and may as well judge the Controversies); but, that some Rule there is, to whom, in such case, they are to adhere; whom to relinquish; (it being as necessary, for the same divine providence, to leave some means, by which to know our Guide, as to give us one.) And this Rule also by tradition hath been, and in reason can be, no other, but that, in Judges Ecclesiastical subordinate (whether Persons, or Councils) dissenting, men ought to adhere to the Superior; in Judges equal dissenting, to adhere to the Major, not minor, part. For Example. In England, a Synod Diocesan, and one compounded of

of both the Provinces dissenting, here Obedience is due to the *Provincial Synod*, or Convocation; and, in the *Provincial Synod* again, when a minor part dissents, due to the *Major*. Otherwise any man may hold what doctrine liketh him best, and oppose the maintainers of the contrary; since ordinarily, some Ecclesiastical Governor, either *Inferior*, or *Superior*; if not a *greater*, yet some *smaller* part, or other, of them, may be found also to hold it. And thus the Unity of this Catholick Church, as to doctrine, is quite overthrown.

Now to speak of these two first, of the *Superior*, and then of the *Major*, part, more distinctly.

1st. In *Persons*, or *Councils*, subordinate, that the *Superior*, in case of any dissent, rightly challengeth our Obedience, I think it out of dispute. So, in *England*, for the establishing of the authority of the supreme *National Synod*, and the Obedience thereto, in respect of all *Inferiors*, thus to prevent dissensions, see the Decree in *Can. 139. & 140.* of the Synod, under *K. James. 1603.* Where it is said, — *Whoever shall affirm, that the Sacred Synod of this Nation is not the true Church of England by representation. — Or shall affirm, that no manner of person, either of the Clergy, or Laity, not being themselves particularly assembled in the said Sacred Synod, are to be subject to the Decrees thereof in causes Ecclesiastical, as not having given their voices unto those Decrees, let him be excommunicated, and not restored, until he repent, and publicly revoke that his wicked Error.* And, for Obedience to his *Highest Ecclesiastical Court*, see the *King's* resolute Speech in the Conference at *Hampton-Court* ||. — *I will have one doctrine, and one Discipline; one religion in substance, and Ceremony; and therefore I charge you never to speak more to that point (How far you are bound to obey?) when the Church hath ordained it.* [What Subjection then, for preserving Unity, is required in the *English Church*, cannot reasonably be disallowed by them in the *Catholick*.]

Again, see in *Dr. Hammond's* Book of Schism || c. 3. an acknowledgment of the primitive subordination, as of a *Presbyter* to the *Bishop*, so of *Bishops* to *Metropolitans*; of *Metropolitans* to *Primates*, or *Patriarchs*; where he comes short but one Link of those which the *Roman Church* maintains, viz. Of the *Patriarchs* to the *Proto-Patriarch*, or the *Bishop of Rome*. And again, see his acknowledgment || of a Subordination of all these severed persons to the whole Corporation, or Body of them assembled in Council: (in which Council, he saith, It is evident, that the power which severally belongs to each Bishop, is there united.) I add, and therefore if that Power which they have severally, be held by di-

§. 24. n. 1.

I.

p. 722

|| Schism

c. 8. p. 158.

Answ. to

Cath. Gent.

p. 29.

|| Answ. to

Cath. Gent.

p. 29. §. 9.

10.

vine.

vine right, so is this, which they have conjunctly, notwithstanding what is of late disputed against it||]: *He acknowledgeth (I say) a subordination of all the Bishops in a Province, to a Council Provincial; in a Nation to a Council National; of all Christianity, to a Council General. Only here he omits one subordination well known in the Church, and sufficiently attested by other Protestants, viz. a subordination of the Bishops of several Nations that are under one Patriarch, to a Council Patriarchal.*

Which defect of his give me leave to supply to you out of Dr. Field, and Bishop Branchal, Authorities as authentick as his. || Of the Church, p. 518. Thus then Dr. Field||, — *These Patriarchs might convocate the Metropolitans of their several divisions, and hold a Patriarchal Council, which was of greater Authority, than either those in the several Provinces, or of a whole Nation, formerly mentioned; because it consisted of more, and more honourable, Bishops: yet had the Patriarchs no greater Authority over the Metropolitans within their larger Circums, than the Metropolitans within their lesser Compass.* And (Ib. §. 13.) shewing, against Bellarmine, that, by reason of the several subordinations of the Church's Officers, and of their Consuls, there was no further necessity of a Monarchical Government in the Church, for conserving the unity thereof. —

|| I. 5. c. 30. p. 513. *If (saith he) a Synod consisted of the Metropolitans, and Bishops of one Kingdom, or State only, the chief Primate was Moderator; If of many [Kingdoms] one of the Patriarchs, and chief Bishops of the whole World [was Moderator]: Every Church. [and therefore this of England, as to Ecclesiastical Government] being subordinate to some one of the Patriarchal Churches, and incorporate into the unity of it.* Thirdly, the Actions of a whole Patriarchship were subject to a Synod Oecumenical.

And elsewhere he saith||, — *That it is evident, that there is a power in Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs, to call Episcopal, Provincial, National, and Patriarchal Synods; and, that, neither so depending on, nor subject to the power of Princes, but that, when they are enemies to the Faith, they may exercise the same without their consent and privacy, and subject them that refuse to obey their summons to such punishment, as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of such contempt or wilfull negligence.* And|| — *That Decrees of Popes made with the consent and joint concurrence of the Western Bishops did binde the Western Provinces that were subject to him as Patriarch of the West. Binde them so, as that these had not liberty to contradict the judgment of the Patriarch, & this Council; as appears, Ib. c. 39. p. 563. where he quotes the Emperors Law (Novel. 223. c. 22.) confirmed in the 9. Canon of Conc. Chalcedon, — Nulla pars ejus sententia*

|| 51. 38. c. p. 557.

ria contradicere valente. And thus Bishop Bramhall ||, What power || Vind. of
the Metropolitan had over the Bishop of his own Province, the same the Church
had a Patriarch over the Metropolitans, and Bishops of sundry Pro- of England,
vinces, within his own Patriarchate. — And afterward — Wherein p. 257.
then consisted Patriarchal Authority? in ordaining their Metropo-
litans (for with inferior Bishops they might not meddle) or confirm-
ing them, in imposing of hands, or giving the Pall; in convocating
Patriarchal Synods; and presiding in them, &c. when Metropolitan
Synods did not suffice to determine some emergent differences, or diffi-
culties.

So in Schism-guarded, p. 349. he saith, — That the
Ecclesiastical Head of the Church is a General Council; and under
that each Patriarch in his Patriarchate; and among the Patriarchs,
the Bishop of Rome, by a Priority of Order. And see Ibid. p. 4.

his allowing this Bishop to be *Exordinum Unitatis*. The Eccle-
siastical Unity in which Bishop Gratius conceiveth so necessary, as
that he saith || — *Non posse Protestantés inter se jungi, nisi simul* || River.
jungantur cum eis, qui sedi Romana coherent, sine qua (saith he) *Apol. Dis-*
nulla sperari potest in Ecclesia commune regimen. Again — *Inter cusp.* p. 255.

causas [divulsionis] Ecclesia non esse Primatum Episcopi Romani
secundum Canones favens Melancthone, qui cum Primatum etiam ne-
cessarium putat ad retinendam unitatem. Neque enim hoc esse Ecclesiam
subjecit Pontificis libidini, sed reponere ordinem sapienter institutum.
Thus moderate Protestants of the Church's Unity founded su-
premely (as to single persons) in the Bishop of Rome. And, this
of the subordination of the Bishops of several Nations to a Council
Patriarchal, taken out of others, because omitted by D. Hammond.

Above which, the next and highest subordination is, that of all
the Bishops in Christianity to a Council General. To which
General Council D. Hammond thus professeth elsewhere || the due || Of Heresie:
subjection of the Church of England: — Upon the strength of this §. 11. p. 142.
persuasion (saith he) that God will never permit any such universal
testimony concerning the faith to conspire in conveying errors to us, as
we have never yet opposed [never opposed, that implies obedience
of Silence; but, upon the former persuasion, I see not, why he
should not say, never dissented from] any universal Council, nor
other voice of the whole Church, such as, by the Catholick Rules, can
be contested to be such; so, for the future, we profess never to do.
And on 1 Tim. 3. 15. The Church is the Pillar and Ground of truth,
he comments thus. — According to this it is, that Christ is said
(Eph. 4. 11.) to have given not only Apostles, &c. but also Past-
ors, and Teachers (i.e. the Bishops in the Church) for the compacting
of the Saints into a Church, for the continuing them in all truth, that
we should be no longer, like children, carried about with every wind
of

of doctrine. And so again, when heresie came into the Church in the first Ages, it is every where apparent by Ignatius's Epistles, That the only way of avoiding error and danger, was to adhere to the Bishop in communion, and doctrine; and whosoever departed from him, and that form of wholesome words kept by him, was supposed to be corrupted. And the same thing also (to S.W. objecting, That it
|| Schism dis- be corrupted. And the same thing also (to S.W. objecting, That it
arm. p. 255. availed not for freedom from Schism, to adhere to the Authority of our Bishop (as the Arrians did) if such Bishop hath rejected the au-

|| Answ. to thority of his Superiors, and taught contrary to them) He grants ||
Schism dis- concerning any Bishops, and those adhering to them, if departing
arm. p. 261. from their Superiors, — That retaining the Authority of their

|| Of Schism Bishops is not, being taken alone, any certain Argument or Evidence
c. 3. — Answ of not being schismatics, &c. This he, for establishing such

to Cath. Church-authority, and the due subordinations thereof; from a
Gentl. p. 30. ny of which (whether person, or Council,) a voluntary departure

|| Answ. to of those, who are subordinate||, or also a wilful continuance un-
Cath. Gentl. der their censures laid upon them||, is by him declared
p. 9. §. 4. Schism.

§. 24. n. 2.
|| Of Schism
P. 34. **[** Of which Schism he speaks thus, || First, (saith he) those Brethren, or People, which reject the Ministry of the Deacons, or Presbyters in anything, wherein they are ordained, and appointed by the Bishop, (and as long as they continue in obedience to him), and of their own accord do break off and separate from them, refuse to live regularly under them, they are by the ancient Church of Christ adjudged and looked on as Schismatics. **[** Here then are many late Sects among Protestants (I know not well by what name to call them) that rejecting the Clergy, are therefore confessed guilty of Schism **]** — In like manner (saith he ||) if we ascend to the next higher link, that of the Bishop, to whom both Presbyters and Deacons, as well as the Brethren or People are obliged to live in obedience, the withdrawing or denying this obedience in any of these will certainly fall under this guilt. — And, as this obedience may be of two sorts, either of a lower, or of a higher kinde, (the denying obedience in any particular lawful command of the Superior, or the casting off all obedience together; dethrining them, or setting up our selves either in their steads, or in opposition to them,) so will the Schism be also a lighter, and a grosser separation. **[** And here are all Protestant, Presbyterial, whether Persons, or Churches, (for any thing I can understand) that oppose Episcopacy, or settle instead of it a Presbyterial Church-Government, confessed also by him guilty of Schism; of Schism, I mean from their spiritual Superiors; whereby also they become no members of the Church-Catholick; for this Church-Catholick stands always contradictory to Heretical, and

Schismatical

Schismatical Churches: nor are any such Schismatics (known to be so, and not recanting such their Schism) to be admitted to enjoy the communion of the Presbytery of any Church, that professeth it self a member of the Catholick. Which thing will 1st. cut off no small body of the Protestants from the Catholick Church; And 2ly. will render, in some manner, partaker of their guilt any other Protestant-Clergy that shall communicate (knowingly) with them: Thus far proceeds Dr. Hammond. The same sentence, upon the Presbyterians deserting their Bishops, that is, their spiritual Superiors, pronounceth Dr. Ferne.

—They have incurred (saith he) by leaving us (and I wish they would sadly consider it) no less then the guilt of Schism, which lies heavily on as many, as have (of what perswasion or sect soever) wilfully divided themselves from the Communion of the Church of England, whether they do this by a bare separation, or by adding violence, and sacrilege to it. — For making good (saith he) this charge of Schism against them, we will premise some undeniable truths, which speak the Authority of Church Governors, the obedience due thereunto, the condition of Schism, and the danger, and guilt of it. The first is, that the Church of Christ is a Society, or Company under a Regiment, discipline, Government; and the members constituting that Society are either persons taught, guided, governed, or persons teaching, guiding, governing, and thus in order to preserve all in unity, and to advance every member of this visible Society, to an effectual and real participation of Grace, and Union with Christ the Head; and therefore, and upon no less account, is obedience due unto them, (Eph. 4. 11, 12, 13, 16. and Heb. 13. 17.) and he that will not hear the Church, to be as a Heathen, and Publican, Mat. 16. &c. Thus he. And thus clear-sighted men are in the case where they or their Relations are to require obedience; but not so, where, to yield it. This being said of the Schism of Presbyters departing from their Bishops; the same Dr. Hammond saith

|| The Case between Engl. and Rome, p. 46, 48.

|| of the Schism of Bishops departing from their Metropolitans; and of Metropolitans, from their Primats, or Patriarchs: who (Schism, c. 3. §. 20.) concludes thus. — By all this and much more which might be added it is manifest, that as the several Bishops had Praefecture over their several Churches and over the Presbyters, Deacons, and People under them; such as could not be cast off by any without the guilt & brand of Schism; So the Bishops themselves of the ordinary inferiour Cities (for the preserving of unity, and many other good uses) were submitted to the higher power of Archbishops or Metropolitans: [he having shewed in 1. c. 1. §. 2. the first institution thereof Apostolical; in Titus, and Timothy.] Nay we must yet ascend (saith he) one degree higher,

|| Of Schism c. 3. §. 20, 25.

from

from this of *Archbishops or Metropolitans* to that *Supreme* of *Primates or Patriarchs* [concerning whose Authority having produced several Canons of Councils, §. 25. he concludes thus]: — All [these Canons or Councils] deducing this power of *Primates* over their own *Bishops* (and together excluding all *foreign Pretenders* [i.e. those who are coequal]) from the *Apostles* and first *Planters* of the Churches: Wherein that which is pertinent to this place, is only this; that there may be a disobedience, & irregularity, and so a Schism, even in the *Bishops*, in respect* of their *Metropolitans*, and* of the authority which these have, by *Canon* and *Primitive Customs*, over them; which was therefore to be added to the several speeches of Schism set down in the former Chapters. Now to go on.

If then (for example), the *Presbyter* is bound upon such a guilt to obey his *Bishop*, then the subjects of both the *Presbyter* and the *Bishop*, when these two *Superiors* dissent from each other are tied to adhere to the *Bishop*, not to the *Presbyter*, i. e. to obey him, whom the other, if he continued in his duty, ought also to obey; & sic de ceteris. And accordingly, in all those instances gathered out of Antiquity by *Archbishop Laud*, §. 24. n. 5. where Inferiour Synods have reform'd abuses in manners, or made Decrees in causes of faith (as it is willingly granted many have done) it cannot be shewed, that any one of those he instanceth in, hath done either of these in matters stated, before, contrarily by a Superior Authority (the thing, with which Protestants are charged, when they bring these instances to clear them); Something was then stated, or reformed, by Inferiours without, but nothing against, their Superiors. These *subordinations* then known, Christians also cannot but know, in the division of Church-Governours, distinct in dignity, still those, to whom their obedience is for ever fastned,

§. 25. n. 7.

2.

2. Next, *In a Body, or Court, consisting of many of an equal rank*, (as Councils, the supreme Ecclesiastical Judge, do) in which body some dissenters in all, or most causes, or decisions, may, and usually, do happen, here it is necessary, for rendering the decrees of such complex bodies effectual, that, at least the *much major part* thereof joyned with the prime Apostolick See, conclude the whole, and the *traditionary practice* of the most universally-allowed Councils, from the beginning of Christianity (as likewise the same practice in all Civil Courts of the like composition) doth sufficiently put this out of dispute, if any thing can be so. See what is said of this already, Disc. 1. §. 28. 28.

Where, if it be further demanded, what proportion for legitimizing the Acts of such a Council, or also for the sufficient acceptance,

acceptation of such Act, or Definition, by the Church Catholick; this *major* part, whether defining in Council, or accepting out of it, is to bear in respect of the *minor*, or how much to exceed it; I know not, what better director herein we can have, than the former custom of the Catholick Church, and the example, and pattern of the *primitive* times; Nor what greater justification the proceedings of *later* Councils can receive herein, than that the same practice, as theirs is, appears in those ancient Councils that are universally allowed.

□ If then we do stay here a little, to review the proceedings of the *first* Councils, and do think the latter times may safely steer according to their course, Looking into the first Council of *Nice*; we find, in *Hilarius* ||, no less than eighty Bishops, before || *De Synodis* this Council was assembled, mentioned to have disallowed the reception of the word *iusus*; (See also what Bishops, *Arius* pretended, to have sided with him, in his Letter to *Euseb. Nicomed.* written some yeares before the *Nicene* Council ||); and, in || *Apud E-* the Council also we find, * seventeen Bishops (some of note) at the *pipb. Her.* first to have dissented from the rest; and, after the Council, * *Ari-* 69. -- *Theo-* anism, in the Eastern parts, to have grown, in a small time, to *der. l. i. c. 5.* a much greater bulk, (supporting their cause with several unwary expressions of former Ecclesiastical Writers, as *Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexand. Origen*, || before a || See *Peta-* stricter discussion of this controversie.) Yet was this no diminution *visu in E-* to the strength of the *Nicene* decree; or to a valid acceptation *pipb. Her.* thereof; both these being done by a much greater part of the 69. Church. Again, In the *Second General Council* held at *Constantinople*, we finde ||, that of the totall number of 150 Bishops || *Socras l. 5.* assembled there, near-upon a fourth part, *viz.* 36 Bishops of them *c. 8, 10.* defended *Macedonianism*, denying the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and persisted in their dissent from the rest of the Council both in, and after, it. Yet was this held no sufficient Debilitation of Its Decree; inserted, nevertheless, into the *Nicene* Creed.

Again, in the third General Council of *Ephesus*, we finde *John* the Patriarch of *Antioch* with his Oriental Bishops (above thirty) favouring *Nestorianism*, and opposing the decrees of the rest of that Council; yet did not the other part of that Council forbear to define *Anti-Nestorianism* without, and against, them; and also to excommunicate them for their non-conformity to the *major* part; nor did the Christian world cease to account the acts of this Council valid, without the acceptation thereof by this Patriarch, and his party, so long as these acts were justified by the

the much greater part of the Church Catholick, joyned with the Roman Patriarch. Neither, supposing that this Patriarch, and his Bishops, and their Successors had continued to this day, (as too many ever since in those parts do, and as they did, for some time) to oppose this decree, could it have rescued *Nestorianism* from being justly reputed an *Heresie*; though this Nestorian party was so considerable, as that the Emperour retarded the Execution of the Council's censures upon them, till that, in the year next ensuing, this Patriarch, and most of the rest, were regained to a peaceable submission to the Church Catholick, and her doctrine.

§. 25. n. 4.

|| In Concil.
Constanti-
nop. apud
Conc Chal-
ced. I.
|| Conc.
Chalc. acti-
one prima.
|| V. Conc.
Chalc. Act.
14.

Come we to the fourth General Council of *Chalcedon*. Two years before this Council sate, when a question was agitated concerning our Lord's consisting of, and in, two natures distinct; distinct, not only before, but after, their union in one person, the prevalent party in a Council of above 120 Bishops assembled at *Ephesus* had defined the contrary, *tanquam de fide*; For which also they pretended the doctrine of the Fathers, *Athanasius*, *Cyril Alexand.* and *Gregory Nazianz.* Concerning which Fathers also you may find *Eutyches* || pleading thus for himself—*Va mihi, si sanctos Patres anathematizavero*--And *Dioscorus* thus ||.—*Ego testimonium habeo sanctorum Patrum Athanasii, Gregorii, Cyrilli in multis locis, quia non oportet dicere post adunationem duas naturas sed unam naturam Dei verbi incarnatam: Ego cum Patribus, ejicio; Ego defendo Patrum dogmata, non transgredior in aliquo, & horum testimonia, non simpliciter, neque transitorie, sed in libris habeo.* Thus *Dioscorus* in the Council of *Chalcedon*, and we find the subscription of 96 Bishops (either deluded, or forced, as they complained afterward) to *Dioscorus* his definition in that former Council. But the great Council of *Chalcedon*, notwithstanding such an opposition, defined the contrary doctrine as of faith; and deposed the chief Actors in this former Council; amongst which were the Patriarchs of *Antioch* and *Alexandria*. And so it was, that to the much greater, and more numerous authority of this Council, all the former subscribers (save only the Patriarch of *Alexandria*,) in the fourth Session, came in, and submitted, not only for their silence (that would not serve the turn,) but assent. But after these come in, there were 11 Egyptian Bishops, i.e. all that were present from the Patriarchy of *Alexandria* (how *Orthodox* I cannot say) that refused still to subscribe to the Council's decrees, alledging the fear of a persecution upon their return into *Egypt*, from their brethren at home, so that these who stayd at home, it seems, were also of a contrary judgment to the Council; yet the Council

both established their decree without them : and required, upon *excommunication*, their *submission* to it; and to *it*, put into the publick confession of their *Faith*. Yet more; After this Council ended, *Timotheus* the usurping Patriarch of *Alexandria*, (after *Proterius*, who was placed there by the Council, slain), and his adherents, continuing still to profess *Dioscorism*, or a mitigated Eutyochianism, condemned the Acts of *Chalcedon*, and much solicited the Emperour by Letters to call a new Council; and besides these a very great faction in *Palestine* did the same, whose followers also continue the same division to this day, not only the *Egyptians*, but the *Aethiopians*, or *Abyssines*, *Armenians*, *Jacobites* of *Syria*, &c. giving to the Adherents of the Council, that are in those parts, the name of *Melchites*, *Royalists*, or *Imperialists*; because they pretended the corruption of this Council by the Emperours faction: yet the owning of this Council by *S. Peters Chair*, and the acceptation thereof by much the greatest part of the Church-Catholick, was, and still is, not doubted to be a sufficient *ratification* of its Acts, notwithstanding this storm in the Patriarchy of *Alexandria*, against this fourth General Council, much worse than that of *Antioch*, against the third.

Before the *seventh* General Council, the second *Nicene*, a question being on foot concerning the lawful use, and also relative veneration, of Images; a Council assembled of above a hundred Bishops under *Constantinus Copronymus*, though indeed none of the Patriarchs joyned with them, defined it *negatively*; and, for making good their Tradition for this, produced several places out of the Fathers, particularly out of *Epiphanius*, *Nazianz*, *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius*, *Eusebius Casariensis*, and others, (See 2. *Conc. Nic. Act. 6. Tom. 5.*) yet, so soon as the Church recovered her liberty by the death of this Emperour, It in a fuller body met at *Nice*, the Patriarchs also present, notwithstanding such a party-preventing them, declared their Faith contrary, with an Anathema to all dissenters from their decree.

In the Council of *Sardica*, the Oriental Arrian Bishops, about 70, withdrew themselves from the Council to *Philippopolis*; because, it consisting of above 300 Western Bishops besides them; they saw their number too small to invalidate the Acts of a party so much greater; nor are these Acts deemed by the Church to lose any of their vigour by the secession of such a party, though indeed these, being condemned already for Hereticks by the *Nicene Council*, could have no just vote in any following.

Before all these Councils, a great question arose in the Church about the validity of Heretick's baptism, and whether the

§. 25. n. 95.

§. 25. n. 95.

the Tradition, commonly practised; of non-rebaptizing those that are converted from Heresie, were Apostolical or no: (though

|| Ep. 73. ad Firmilian seems to pleade also a contrary Tradition in those parts where he lived. *Ceterum nos (saith he) veritati, & consuetudinem jungimus, & consuetudini Romanorum consuetudinem, sed veritatis, opponimus: ab initio hoc tenentes, quod a Christo, & ab Apostolo traditum est*], A part of the Church-Catholick questioning this Tradition, because another more certain Apostolical Tradition, viz. the Scriptures, seemed to them to declare plainly the contrary. A difficult controversie this was accounted; several Provincial Councils in divers parts were held about it: above 80 African Bishops assembled with their Primat, S. Cyprian, and likewise Firmilian, and some fifty other Eastern Bishops joyned with him, judged it not Apostolical||. Yet after all this, a General Council proceeded to decide it; and their definition was esteemed valid, and obliging, and those who continued in their former opinion (which in Affrick was no small number; in S. Austins time above 150 Bishops||) were from that time accounted Hereticks. 'Tis true, that this General Council|| was held some 50 years after the other Provincial ones; and that, before this, several of the African Bishops had corrected their former opinion. But I suppose none will say, that a General Council, if assembled at the same time, with those Provincial, could not justly have defined it against them, (as Stephanus his Council at the same time did) and could not justly have required their Obedience, as they being, though a considerable number, yet a much smaller part, compared with the rest of the Bishops of the Christian world, and their Suffrage invalid *Contra tot millia Episcoporum, quibus tunc error in toto Orbe displicuit*, to use S. Austins words *contra Cresconium*, l. 3. c. 3. Who elsewhere also|| speaks thus on this matter.

|| De Baptismo, l. 3. c. 3. — *Quaestio hujus Obscuritas, prioribus Ecclesia temporibus ante Schisma Donati magnos viros, & magna charitate praelatos, Patres, Episcopos, ita inter se compulsi salva pace disceptare, atque fluctuare, ut diu Conciliorum in suis quibuscunque Regionibus diversa statuta mutaverint*, [So, contra Cresconium, l. 1. c. 33. he saith, *Similiter inter Apostolos de Circumcisione quaestio, sicut postea de Baptismo inter Episcopos, non parva difficultate nutabat*], *dones plenario totius orbis concilio, quod saluberrime sentiebatur, etiam remotis dubitationibus firmaretur.*]

them have been defended by a numerous Party in the Church, yet have been afterward defined, and declared, as matter of Faith; and that such opposition of a number, though in it self considerable, yet in respect of the whole, much smaller, hath been thought insufficient to debilitate the authority, and decisions of the rest, confirmed by the judgment of the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Chair of *S. Peter*; and that the Church may cut off from her Body, for the safety of the whole, (if such part happen to be gangred, or putrified) not only a little Finger, or Toe, but an Arm, or a Leg. But yet I would not have this so understood, as if that the Church's Councils, in this affair of the very greatest concernment, do at any time proceed to declare as matter of Faith any Propositions, save * such, as to disengaged judgments carry great evidence in them, flowing either from express former Tradition, or a clear deduction; and * such, as are admitted, and allowed by much the greatest part of the Church Catholick.

And in particular, the late Council of *Trent* (very prudently considering the great distraction, and dissatisfaction of those times, and their proneness to Schism) is said (if we may believe *Seave* ||) to have entertained this Maxim; That, to establish a Decree of Reformation, a major part of Voices was sufficient; but that a Decree of Faith could not be made, if a considerable part did contradict. But this considerable part must always be understood of such as are Catholick, i.e. such as, by no formerly condemned Heresie, are rendred incapable of voting in the Church's Councils. And lastly, if a Contest arises concerning what part may be called considerable, I see not to whom the judgment of this can be left, save to the same major part, whether in, or out, of the Council, where ever all are not agreed and of the same mind concerning it. This of the necessity, and of the ancient practice, of a much major part at least (so we keep still within the bounds of the Church-Catholick) its concluding the whole.

Where it is also worth the noting concerning times past; that (though we set aside here the necessity of the Confirmation of Councils by the always-esteemed most supreme Authority Ecclesiastical on Earth, the Bishop of *Rome*, yet) never any Heresie (now universally so accounted) hitherto can be shewed in any age to have been established in any Council, or accepted after it, by the major part of Christianity, or of the Church-Governors thereof; such especially, as have Right to vote in Councils, because found guilty of no Heresie, that hath been declared such by a former Council.

And for the Future likewise. The Church's Vigilance from

|| Hist. 1. 6.
p. 576.

§. 26. N. 1.

from our *Lord's* promised perpetual assistance, and favour, may be presumed to be such, as that her *Councils*, either distributed in several *Provincial* ones, or united in a *General*, will condemn any *grievous* and *pernicious* Error, before it shall spread so far, as to infect a *major part* of the *Ecclesiastical Governors*, and so be past all cure from this supreme Court: And then after such Church-censure and mark set once upon it, though its Patrons should grow to a major part of *Christianity*, yet do they now, to all, clearly appear, I say, not a less, but no, part of the *Church-Catholick*,

But yet, for any such after-growth of a condemned Heresie, all those Texts of Scripture (whether Prophecies, or Promises there), that are pressed by *S. Austin* against the *Donatists*, and the many Arguments he drew from them, seem to evince the contrary: Namely, that never any such Sect (I mean of *one* Denomination, or conspiring in any *one* Heresie), shall be at any time, that shall, for the multitude of its Followers, and Latitude of its Extent, exceed, or match the *Catholick*, As for *Hereticks*, or *Schismatics* of many different Tenents, and Communions, dissenting from one another; what Magnitude, or Bulk the whole Mass of them put together, may amount to, or whether not transcend the *Catholick*, it much matters not. For the *Catholick Church* being (according to our Creed) always but *One*, and a Body united, in a due subordination of its Governors; in its Service, Doctrine, Discipline, &c. so far as these things do also model and distinguish those Sects from one another, it is sufficiently, for its magnitude, and extent, discerned from all the rest, if, of any *one* Society, or Church, that hath the former coherence in its Members, the *Catholick* be the *greatest*, and the *most diffused*: Of

|| *De Pastoribus.* c. 8.

which thus *S. Austin* observes ||.—*Non omnes Heretici per totam faciem terra, sed tamen Heretici per totam faciem terra; alii hic, alii ibi.*—*Alia Secta in Africa, alia Heresis in Oriente, alia in Egypto, alia in Mesopotamia. Diversis locis sunt diversa, sed una Mater Superbia genuit, sicut una mater nostra Catholica omnes Christianos fideles toto Orbe diffusos.*—*Est in Africa pars Donati; Eunomiani non sunt in Africa; sed cum parte Donati est hic Catholica. Sunt in Oriente Eunomiani, ibi autem non est pars Donati; sed cum Eunomianis ibi est Catholica.*

The sum is, the *Catholick Church* is every where and every where Heresie; but the *Catholick* every where *one*, the other *diverse*; the *Greatest*, but *many*, may be Heresies; the *Greatest* that is *one*, must be the *Catholick*.

§. 26. n. 2.

There are two General Councils by Protestants frequently

quently urged for decreeing, or confirming *Heretick*; the second of *Ephesus*, and that of *Ariminum*.

But 1st. For that of *Ephesus*: Both the whole West out of the Council (then the greater, and more dignified part of the Church Catholick) and the Pope's Legates, and likewise many eminent *Eastern Bishops* in the Council (who suffered much persecution for it from the present secular power) dissented from the Acts thereof; and the main Body of Bishops also, that in the Council subscribed to them, complained, in the following Council of *Chalcedon*||, of force|| *Act. 1.* used.

And 2. For that of *Ariminum*. 1st. Though the major part of it had been *Arrians*; yet these, having been declared *Hereticks* already by the Council of *Nice*, and so now no true Members of the Church-Catholick||, could rightly have no|| *See before, Prop. 4.* Vote therein; though the then *Arrian Emperor* forced, upon the Council, an admittance of them. So that if the major part of the Church-Governors, generally taken, of that age, had maintained an Heretical Tenent, yet this was, after that the major part of *Christianity* in a former Council, and in a General acceptance thereof, had condemned this Tenent for *Heretical*; and so thence Christians might clearly discern the Maintainers of it to be no more Members of the Church-Catholick, nor their present Guides: Especially when the rest preserved a *Communion* separated from them.

But 2^{ly}, He, that pleaseth to examine the History of this Council, and of these times, I think will find no ground to affirm *Arrianisme* at any time to have infected, or possessed a major part of *Christianity*. Which, because it is a thing much insisted on by Protestants, labouring thereby to prove, for some time, a desertion of the major part of the Church Catholick from one of the greatest Articles of the Christian Faith, I suppose it worth my pains, though stepping aside a little from my present Design, to give you a brief Narrative thereof. In which if already satisfied, you may, omitting it, pass on to §. 27. n. 4.

¶ If we reveiw the Changes that were made in the Church after the Nicene, and before the Councils of *Ariminum* in the West, and *Seleucia* in the East.

1st. For the East, till the Council at *Seleucia*, Though several eminent Catholick Bishops, by *Constantius* his power which favoured the *Semi-Arians*, were expelled from their Seats, upon several particular false Criminations, and among others, upon the presence of their maintaining *Sabellianisme*, or confounding the Persons of the Trinity; Yet was nothing then declared against the *Nicene Creed*.

And

And after this Expulsion, there were, in a Council, held under him at *Amictch*, A. D. 341. of 99 Bishops assembled, only
 || See Baron. 36 *Arrian*, the rest *Orthodox* ||; (though the *Arrian* party indeed
 A. D. 341. was more powerful with the *Emperor* :) and the substance of the
 Form of Faith drawn up there, was, though diminutive to the
 || 1.3.6.5. *Nicene*, yet *Catholic*; (and such (saith *Sozomen* ||) , *ut neque*
Arrianis, *neque* *Contilii Niceni fautores*, *compositionem verborum*,
quod Sacra litera ejusmodi minime complecterentur, *insectari possent*.
 After this, upon the calling of the Council at *Sardica*, A. D. 347.
 the *Eastern* Bishops, that were assembled at *Phlippopolis*, and,
 (though they condemned *Arrianisme*, yet) maintained *Semi-*
Arrianisme, were only 76. whilst the *Orthodox Sardian* Bishops
 were about 300.

In the next Council following, at *Sirmium*,
 convened for destroying the new Heresie of *Phorinus*, both the
 first, and last Form of the Faith that was composed by the *Eastern*
 Bishops there, (for the second Form themselves disallowed),
 though defective, yet contained nothing in them, that might not
 well be taken in a *Catholic* sense. And in such a sense was the
 || lib. de Sy- first of these Forms explained by *S. Hilarius*, || writing in those
 nodis. very times. And *Baronius* saith ||, — *In tanta errorum offusa cali-*

|| A. D. 328. *gine*, *qui Substantia Filii Dei Assertores essent*, *a nostris in pretio ha-*
bebantur, *reputo quod (ut sapius est dictum) nulla alia re viderentur a*
Catholicis differre, *nisi quod vocem consubstantialitatis non. admitterent*.
 From which it follows; that it is not necessary, that all the
Subscribers of these *Credo*s, should either be *Arrian* or *Semi-*
Arrian. And there seems to be a great hand of the *Divine Providence* in it,
 That it is *Professed* in these *Credo*s — That *Filius* did
ex Patris Substantia constare; or, that he was *Patris per omnia*
similis; *etiam quoad substantiam*, or *Essentiam* : Again that he was
ante omne tempus aut seculum, all which is most true; But it is not
professed there at all, what these *Semi-Arrians* held further; That
 the Son, though he had altogether the like, yet had not the self-
 same, essence with the Father; [which Identity of Essence they
 thought could not consist with the distinction of the Persons]. —
 And, that the Son, though *ante omne tempus*, yet was not co-eter-
 nal with the Father; [for this co-eternity they thought consisted
 not with his Generation]. This, I say, in those *Credo*s is not
 mentioned. So, but that the words are well capable of an *Ortho-*
dox sense. So that the 17th and the 26th Articles in the first *Sir-*
mian Confession as they are understood by *Sozomen*, in the *Semi-*
Arrian || so are they (being compared with the Antecedents) ex-
 || 4. l. 5. a. † *De Syno-*
dis. pounded by *S. Hilary* † in a *Catholic* sense. The *Semi-Arrian*
 Bishops, it seems, either thinking it enough, as to the abatement
 of

of the former *Nicens* Decree, if they could free themselves, and others, from being forced to profess any more in the publick Faith, than consisted with their private Opinion; or else knowing the party in their Synods, that revered, and contended for, the *Nicens* Faith, so considerable, as that, if their own Tenets were inserted, they would not have been at such times by a Major part subscribed.

Thus things stood in the *East*, till the Council, of *Seleucia* there; and of *Ariminum*, in the *West*.

2. Next. As for the *West*; till that Council of *Ariminum*, §. 26. n. 4. though, some chief *Bishops*, and among the rest, *Liberius*, Bishop of *Rome*, suffered Persecution for some three or four years before it, for not subscribing to the condemnation of *Athanasius*, unheard, (against whom the Emperor was much incensed, as supposing him the chief cause of the enmity between his Brethren, *Constance*, and *Constantine*, and himself.) yet the main Body of the Western prelacy both remained Catholick, and possessed of their Chairs, till the Meeting of this Council. And *Liberius*, being by the importunity of the *Roman* People recalled from his Banishment, wherein he is said, * to have subscribed to one of the *Sirmian* Forms of Faith; (but, as I said before, this Form expressing nothing in it but what was Catholick;) & * *interdixisse Ecclesia illis, qui Filium Patri non substantia & ceteris rebus omnibus similem asseverarent* [i.e. the *Arrians*] though some others speak yet worse of his behaviour in the time of his Banishment; This *Liberius* I say was now as constant an Oppugner of *Arrianism* as any other, and denied also his consent to the Decree of this Council of *Ariminum*. Now also the *Roman* Clergy were very famous for their Constancy in the *Nicens* Faith, and for their refusing the admission of *Felix*, supposed an *Arrian*, into *Liberius* his Chair. And of the Orthodoxy, at this time, of the other Western Prelates, see what *Hilarius* saith in the beginning of his Book *De Synodis*, directed in his Exile to these Bishops; and lastly, *S. Jerom's* new wonder, — *Ingratus sorsus Orbi, & Arrianum se esse miratu est*, spoken upon a strange, and unexpected, issue of this Council at *Ariminum*, shewing there was no such thing before it.

To come then to this Council at *Ariminum*, 1st. At this Meeting at *Ariminum* of about 400 Bishops assembled, there appeared not above 80. or as *Athanasius* saith, 50. addicted to *Arrianism*, though some of these indeed, the Emperors Favourites; accordingly, the Decree of this Council, confirming that of

§. 26. n. 3.

Athanasius de Synod.

Nice, and condemning *Arrianism*, was sent by them, (though never delivered), to the *Emperor*; and so a dissolution of this Assembly ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~which~~ ^{which} long delayed; several of them without leave departed; the rest, hindered from dissolving, upon much solicitation of the *Emperor's* Agents, and the specious pretence of a firm Peace and Union so to be attained, of the *Western* and *Eastern* Churches, yielded at last to subscribe a Form, in which was (not rejected, but) omitted ~~upon~~ ^{upon} these terms, — *Quod vulgo parum intellectum, offendicula pareret; & quia in Scriptura nunquam memoratur*; — And — *Neque adeo necessarium esset, de Persona Patris, & Filii & Spiritus sancti, unam Substantiam*

|| *Theodoret. nominari* || [where you may observe, the truth of it is no way denied]. This I say was omitted, but nothing affirmed in the Form, which was not well capable of a Catholick sense. If there was, let it be named: For, this Expression — *Credo in Filium Dei similem Genitori suo Patri secundum Scripturas*, I suppose none will say contains any Error or untruth in it; nor opposeth Identity any more, than *S. Paul's* *Imago invisibilis Dei*, Col. 1, 14. *doct.* Or *Christus aequalis Deo*, Phil. 2. 6. (Which Texts were also then urged in defence of it) Especially, when, 1st, the *Arrian* Forms usually joined *per omnia* in explication of it; as may be seen in the third *Sirmian* Form of Faith, (with which this was much what the same:) And so, the *Emperor* *Constantius* exacted this Subscription of *similis per omnia* from *Valens* himself, the chief Leader of the *Arrian* party ||

And 2^d. Next the *Semi-Arians*, in the *per omnia*, included also — *Similis Deo Patri secundum Essentiam*, or *Substantiam*; (from which the Catholics rightly inferred Identity of essence,) And also, went so far, as to admit the word *quoniam* too; and to profess *vocem illam in Concilio Niceno, ad perversam Arrii doctrinam expugnandam, sancte, pieque positam*. — And — *Secundam eandem Fidem, & ante-hac servasse, servare, & ad extremum servaturos* ||. Only they understood this word of the *Nicene* Fathers in a diminutive sense. — And thus speaks *S. Basil* || of their Expression [*Similis secundum Substantiam*] *Siquid ipse sentiam, dicendum est quantum ad similem subscriptionem Essentiam* (siquidem tunc dicto adiunctum fuerit, prorsus contra ullam ipsius essentia variationem) eam ego amplector proboque vocem, ut quae idem significet, quod id quoniam.

|| *Socrat. l. 4. c. 11.* || *† Socrat. l. 3. c. 21.* || *Ad maximum Philosophum.* || *Ep. ad c. 1.* || But yet because this Form, though in some sense true, was general, and suspicious, the *Catholic* Bishops at *Ariminum* refused to subscribe it, gave upon some Additions to be annexed; so to secure the Church's Faith from *Arrianism*, and other misconstitutions; after the word *quoniam* was now left out. In which

Addi-

Additions, to give you *Severus* his words || — *Primum damnatus* || *Hist. l. 2.*
est Arius; totaque ejus perfidia; deinde Filius Deo Patri æqualis, &
sine initio, sine tempore pronuntiatur [which things infer the Son's
 Eternity and either *Consubstantiality* with the Father, or *Polythe-*
isme, which latter was denied by the *Arrians* themselves.] —
Tum Valens (saith he) *tanquam nostros adjuvans, subjecit Sententi-*
am; Filium Dei non esse Creaturam, sicut ceteras Creaturas, &c. [i. e.
 (as he was understood by the Council) *sicut cetera omnia sunt*
Creature]. To these, *S. Jerom* adds, (as he saith, out of
 the Records of the Council it self), several *Anathemas*; that were
 pronounced, and consented to by the *Arrians*; amongst which
 this is one, — *Si quis Filium Deo non dixerit æternum cum Patre,*
Anathema sit.

These things then being so submitted to by
 the *Arrian* Party, and the *Catholick* Faith now thought secure, the
 Council was dismissed. These things you may see related more
 at large by *S. Jerom* || in defence of the *Catholick* Bishops in that || *Dialog.*
 Council, for the satisfaction of the *Luciferians*; a Sect, that, after *advers. Luk.*
 the flourishing of the *Catholick* Religion, would not admit *ciferian.*
 those Bishops, who voted at *Ariminum*, or had afterwards com-
 municated with the *Arrians*, into their *Communion*: which *Luci-*
ferians likewise urged then, as well as the *Donatists* afterward,
 and the *Reformed* do now of the times before *Luther*, that *Christ*
had no Church [except generally corrupted]; And the Text || *Luk. 18. 8.*
 — *Quod, cum venerit Filius hominis, non inveniet Fidem super ter-*
ram; to which see *S. Jerom's* Answer in the same place.

This for *Ariminum*. At the same time, and upon the same §. 27. n. 1.
 Motive (namely the concluding a firm Peace in the Church *Uni-*
versal) was the other Council held in the East, at *Seleucia*.
 Where, by the Divine Providence, *S. Hilary*, then an Exile in
 the East for the *Catholick* Doctrine was present; and informed the
 Council of the Constancy of the *Western* Bishops in the *Nicene*
 Belief; and, in the Council, himself earnestly contended for it;
 being also assisted by the *Egyptian* Bishops (except *Georgius* the
Alexandrian Usurper) as himself tells us in his Book *contra*
Constantium. This Council (supposed to be in a great part
Semi-Arrian) proceeded no further, than only, to the confirming
 of the forementioned *Antiochian* Creed (in which I said before || §. 26. n. 3.
 nothing was contained not *Catholick*); and afterward, to the ex-
 communicating of the *Arrians*. But, after this Council dissolved,
 the subscription, made at *Ariminum* by the *Occidentals*, being
 brought into the East; and the like, for a general union, being
 with great importunity required by the Emperor, many of these
Seleucian

Solentian Bishops at last yielded to it. For the *Arrian* Agents first pretended (but falsely) to the West, that the *Eastern* Bishops would by no means admit of *Substantia* to be mentioned in the Creed and then urged to these *Eastern* Bishops, professing such substance, the prescription of the West for omitting of it. Meanwhile, by the very same deception, and fraud, was this subscription procured in the East from the Bishops, being most of them Orthodox, or at most but semi-arrians, as at *Ariminum*. Of which *Solentian* Bishops *Sozomen* saith || — that omnes, paucis exceptis, in eo uno dissederunt; quod pars filium Patri Consubstantialem, pars autem substantia similem, esse dicerent. And, of the fraud used there toward the Orthodox (see much what the same complaint made by *Naxianzen* (his father, a Catholic Bishop, amongst others, being involved in it,) as is by *S. Jerom* for the West — *Impietati* (saith he ||) per scripti dogmatis ambiguitatem, fenestram aperuit; [*Concilium Constantinopolitanum*] hoc quidem praeceperunt, quasi Scripturam ueretur, ac vocum probatissimarum usum amplecteretur. — And — *Ea res permultos e nobis, invitatos aliqui viros, in fraudem impulit; qui quatenus mente nequaquam pro lapsi fuerint, subscriptione tamam transversi acti sunt, &c.* See also *Libertius* his Letter to the Eastern Bishops, in *Secrates* l. 4. c. 11. Yet was not this subscription (any more then the Western at *Ariminum*), so universal, but that, besides *Athanasius*, and most of the Egyptian Bishops, there were several others of note, that then fully and openly professed the *Nicene* faith; as *Cyril* Bishop of *Jerusalem*; *Melchius*, who made that valiant confession thereof not only with his mouth; but, when that stopped, with his fingers, before the people of *Antioch*), *Eusebius Samosatenus*, and others. Nor yet was the thing subscribed so grateful to the *Arrians*, but that, in a meeting of them shortly at *Antioch* ||, they grew bold to alter it, and at last to put in the Creed, not only what was general, or ambiguous, but false; i. e. their own Anti-Nicene Tenent.

|| L. 4. c. 18.

|| *Orat. in laud. Athanasii.*

|| *Sozomen*. l. 4. c. 28.

§ 27. n. 2.

Thus passed *Constantius* his times, for some three years, after the *Ariminum* subscription, very severe. But, he dying, the face of the Church was suddenly altered; and *Julian* (succeeding him (equal to all, or rather less disaffected to the Catholics, though a friend to none.) the *Nicene Faith* flourished as formerly; not so much by a new Conversion of the *Arrian* Bishops to the truth, as by a restoration of the formerly deprived Catholic Bishops to their honours, and the possession of their Churches.

|| *Adversus Lucifer* l. 2. — *Dominus excruciat, imperat, persequatur, Beata Constantinus* moritur

modum, tranquillitate radice. *Manifestius dicam. Omnes Episcopi qui de proprio sedebat fuerant exterminati, per indulgentiam novi Principis [Julian, who favoured at first the Catholics] ad Ecclesias redeunt.*

Julian slain, after some years, under *Valens* ruling the East, and siding with the *Arrians*, a new storm arose there, against the *Nicene* faith; and a persecution, and expulsion of many of the *Catholic* Bishops; and these times it is, that *S. Basil* in his Epistles, much cited by Protestants, so sadly deplores?

But 1st. This persecution extended not to the West, where *Valentinian* a *Catholic* Emperour ruled; and where was only a toleration of the *Arrians*; and so some of them, by seeming *Catholic*, as *Auxentius*, Bishop of *Milan* before *S. Ambrose*, did some hurt. But then, by *Gratian* his Son, and Successor, this Toleration was revoked; and also, in the East, upon *Valens* his Uncle's death, were the *Catholic* Bishops restored again to their seats, and the *Arrians* crushed.

2^{ly}. In the East it never swelled so high, but that the Body of the orientall Prelats also, though suffering much from the other favoured Party, remained *Catholic*, as may appear more particularly by *Liberius* his Letter to the Oriental Bishops; and the 75. and 293. Epistles of *S. Basil*, written in the same time of *Valens* his persecution. In which 75th. Epistle, thus *S. Basil*, *Fuerat autem iustius res nostras estimare, non ex uno, aut altero eorum, qui ad veritatem haud recta pede ingrediuntur sed ex multitudine totius orbis Episcoporum, qui gratia Christi conjuncti nobis sunt. — Unamines omnes, eodemque sensu pradii sumus. Itaque si quisque Communionem nostram fugit, ne prudentiam vestram lateat, ab universa illum Ecclesia sese divisisse.*

|| *Apud Socr.*
|| *cr. l. 4. c. 11.*

And now by this Relation may be understood the true sence of those places of the *Fathers*, that are urged for a defection of the greatest part of the Church in these times from the true faith; which places as they are now pressed by many Protestants against the *Roman* Church, so some of them were anciently by the *Donatists* against *S. Austin*; to whose 48. Epistle I refer you, to peruse his Answer.

When therefore *S. Hieron* saith || — || *Dialog.*
Tunc [after the Council of Ariminum] usque nomen abolicum est, adv. Lucianum Nicæna fidei damnatio conclamata est — And — *Nomine u-*
nitatis, & fidei infidelitas scripta est, he meaneth, *Infidelitas, &c.*
according to that sense, and glosse, as the Emperor and *Arrian* party made of the decree, after the Council ended. Saying also,
— *Ingenius totus Orbis [totus Orbis, because the Eastern Bishops at Constantinople, as well as the West before them at Ariminum, by the same fraud made the same subscription], & mira-*

§. 27. x. 32.

ius est se esse Ariannum (see the like Comment in Galat. 5. 9. *Ariannum*; i. e. quite contrary to their intention, and sense, and by an Interpretation of some part of the decree so, as that it contradicted another: therefore also (*ibid*) he saith: how, afterward, *Concurrerant Episcopi qui Ariminensibus de his irriteret, sine consensu Hæretici ferebantur*; *contestantes Corpus Domini, & quicquid in Ecclesia sanctum est, se nihil mali in sua fide suspicatos*, Whence he expostulates with the Luciferians, — *Cur damnassent eos, qui Ariani non erant? Cur Ecclesiam scinderent in concordia fidei permanentem?* &c. From which may be gathered the meaning of several passages urged || out of his Chronicon, declaring the establishment of Arrianism in the *Arimine*, or *Sirmian* Council; and out of his Dialogue against the Luciferians, of the Confessors, (but a few,) admitting all the rest to their Communion; which (he saith there expressely) was done — *Non, quod Episcopi p[ro]fiterentur esse qui Hæretici fuerant; sed quod constaret eos, qui reciperemur, hæreticos non fuisse*. So *Liberius* his words ||, — *Omnes illi fere Episcopi, qui Arimini convenerant, quique vel fallacibus instatibus illecebris, vel vi compulsi, a fide tum quidem destiterant, &c.*] With whom he also joyns the Oriental Orthodox Bishops, to whom he writ [*Quibus item vos perversum blandicias, &c.*] are to be understood only of their failing from such a plenary confession of their faith, as their Christian duty obliged them to, (whom I do not go about here to excuse from all fault; but from heresie), and such expressions as these — *subscripcionem pristinam damnabant* — *fidei formula Ariminensi Anathema denunciarunt*, are to be understood, that they condemned it; nor as it was in their own former sense, false; but as, it was by the later Arrian sense, perverted. In the same sense are those things, said by *Vincentium Lirinensis* ||; *Severum* ||, & others, to be expounded; and those passages of *Nazianzen* ||, where he speaks of the complying lapse of many of the too-credulous Eastern Bishops; and among the rest of his father, yet who was always constantly Cutholick. As for *S. Basil's* sad complaints of the overflow of Arrianism, (to which may be added several in *Nazianzen* ||, they were made concerning the times of *Valens*; and then concerning the *East*, subjected to his power, when can be made no question, as to the Church universal, of the major part of its Prelats their professing the Catholick faith: (Of which see his fore-puoted Epistles ||.) As neither can there be, of the times before *Ariminum*, as to the West; the persecution, then, being in and for the cause, of *Athanasius*, not, of the Nicene faith; so that, how long soever the Arrian error may be said to have continued

|| See Tillot.
Rule of
Faith, p.
167. &c.

|| Apud So-
cr. l. 4. c. 11.

|| t. 6.
|| Hist. l. 2.
|| In Orat.
de laud.
Athan. &
de funere
Patri.
|| Ep. 71. &c
|| Orat. in
Arrian.
|| Epist. 75.
293.

(as

(as it hath to this day in the Mahometans, and, of late, in the Socinians;) yet the great eclipse, which the Nicene Faith may be thought to have suffered thereby, was only from *Arminium* to the reformation of the Catholick Bishops made by *Julian*, i.e. for the space of three years: though, then also the *Lights* of the Church were not extinguished, but only obscured, because removed out of their Candlesticks; And what hath been said here of the *Catholicks Subscription* to the Arrian form of faith, may be said of their communion also with the same Arrians, which lasted only for that small time, that they imagined them, from the additions that were made to the form at *Arminium* ||, and before the manifesting of || See before, their equivocation, good Catholicks. §. 26.n.9.

Lastly, one thing more in this Arrian defection is very considerable: that the Anti-Nicene faction divided presently into two *Sects* (as is usual to those who leave the unity of the Church), the *Arrians*, and the *Semi-Arians*. Which *Sects* persecuted, excommunicated, ejected out of their Chairs, one another. Now one of the properties of the Church-Catholick in the Creed being its *unity* (*Credo unam, &c.*) for the discerning of it always from other Societies, by its more eminent magnitude and extent, it is sufficient, if, of all those Bodies or Churches, that can any way pretend to this property, and that are any way united within themselves, and contradistinct to others, it be the *greatest still*, and *most diffused* (as, if of the two divided parties, neither the Arrian, nor semi-Arian equalled the Catholick) though, by the whole masse of all these Bodies, that fight with one another, cast up together, it should be exceeded. Of which see what is said before §. 26.n.1.

Thus I have, from §. 26.n.3. contrary to my first intention, related this matter more at large; as well knowing, this defection of the Church in the time of Arrianism to be the main, or only, instance, wherewith Protestants seek to countenance that *later*, and *more universal defection*, which many of them charge upon it since the times of *Antichrist*; from A.D. 600: or sooner, till the coming of *Luther*: a defection of above a thousand years durance, and * wherewith they endeavour to prove, an obedience to the sentence of a major part in lawful Councils not to have been always safe. But I think it appears from what hath been said, that this Instance serves not to their purpose. Now to return to the matter in hand. □

From these things then Catholicks infer: *That both the Decrees in a Council, and acceptance of these Decrees out of it,* §. 27.n.4.
R made

made by a much major part of the Church-Governors, (especially, this major part also being joyned to the supreme Pastor of the Church) ought undeniably to conclude the whole; and that all the obedience (forementioned) is due to this much greater, though some smaller parts do dissent; and therefore that an Opposition of their definitions in matter of faith becomes heresie; and a separation from their Communion, upon their requiring an approbation of, and conformity to, such their decrees, becomes Schism; if an opposition to, or separation from, the whole, be so.

§. 28.

Prop. 13.
|| See Calv.
Instit. 1. 4.
c. 1. §. 9.

13. As for that way, or those marks, that are given usually by Protestants ||, by which Christians are to discern, in any division of them, the Society of the true Church-Guides from the false (be those true Guides the more, or the fewer; of a higher, or of a lower rank, as they say sometimes they may be the One, sometimes the other) namely these two, *The right teaching of the Christian doctrine; * And right Administration of the Sacraments*: These, Catholicks think they have just cause to reject, in the Quest here made.

For 1st, If any are directed to finde out by these marks, teaching the true Doctrin, rightly administring the Sacraments, those Guides, not only whose Communion they ought to joyn with; but from whose judgment they ought to learn, which is the same true Christian doctrine; and which is the right administration of the Sacraments; i.e. If any, are, by those marks, first known, directed to finde out those persons, by whom they may come to know these marks; (as for example; If one that seeks a Guide to direct him, what he is to believe in the Controversie of the *Consubstantiality of God the Son with the Father*, is first to try, if the Doctrin of Consubstantiality be true: and then to chuse him for his Guide in this point, that holds it.) The very Proposal of this way seems a sufficient confutation of it. For what is this, but to decide that first themselves, for the decision of which they seek to another judgment? And there is no question, but after this, they will, in a search, pitch on a Judge that decides the point as they do: But then, this is seeking for a Confederate, for a Companion: not seeking for a Guide, for a Governour. When they can state the true doctrine themselves, their search for a Guide to state it is at an end; and they may then search rather to whom to teach it, then of whom to learn it.

§. 29. n. 1.

|| See §. 29.
m. 2.

*Tis granted indeed, (supposing the marks above-named were only to be found among the right Church-Guides, which is not so ||, that these right Guides may be discerned from false by this

this mark, *i.e.* by the truth of that doctrine which they teach, discern'd, I say, by so many persons as can attain the certain knowledge of this true doctrine by some other means, or way; as, by the Holy Scriptures, Fathers, &c. Nor is private men trying the truth of the Doctrine of these differing Guides (by these Scriptures or Fathers) denied here to be lawful; nor denied, that the Proposal of such a trial to the People, may, by the true Guides, even by the Apostles, be made use of with good success; because the Scriptures, &c. may evidence, to some persons intelligent, in some Controversies less difficult, the truth of those Doctrines, which some of the learned, out of great passion, or interest, may gainsay. But then, for all such points, wherein a private man's trial by Scripture is very liable to mistake, and the sense thereof not clear unto him (as no private person hath reason to think Scripture clear in such points of Controversie, wherein the Church-Guides, examining the same Scriptures, yet do differ among themselves, and perhaps the major part of them from him;) he must necessarily attain the knowledge of his right Guide, by some other Marks prescribed him for that purpose; and not by the truth of that doctrine, or clearness of those Scriptures, for instruction in the truth, or sense, of which he purposely seeks such a Guide. Unsound therefore is that Position of Dr. Stillingfleet's, (*Rat. Account, p. 7.*) *That of necessity, the Rule, [I suppose he means, and by it, the Truth] of Faith and Doctrine must be certainly known, before ever any one can with safety depend upon the judgment of any Church:* And very infirm that Arguing of his, and so all, that he afterward builds upon it, where he deduceth from this Proposition conceded—*That, a Church, which hath erred, cannot be relied on [in matter of Religion]; therefore men must be satisfied, [i.e. by tryall of her doctrines] whether a Church hath erred, or no, before they can judge, whether she may be relied on, or no:* for, though this consequent be allowed here, that a Church must not erre, that she may be safely relied on, or, that such Church as may be relied on, hath, amongst other properties, or sure marks, this for one, that she doth not, or cannot, err; yet many other Marks, or Properties she may have, by which men may be assured, both that she, doth not erre, and may be relied on, who are not first able to discern, or prove all her doctrines for truth, or demonstrate her not erring. Such arguing is much-what like to this. That Body, which casts no light, cannot be fire, therefore a man must first be satisfied, whether such a body gives light, before he can judge, whether it be fire. Not so; because one blind, and not seeing the light at all, yet may certainly know it

is fire, by another property; by its scorching *Heat*—Or like this: No Book that contains any false Proposition in it, can be the Book of Holy Scripture; therefore men must be satisfied whether such Book contain any false Proposition in it, or no, before they can judge, whether it be the Book of Holy Scripture, or no. Not so; for men ordinarily, by another way, *viz.* universal Tradition, become assured that such Book is *Holy Scripture*; and thence collect, that it contains nothing in it contradictory, or false: and so it is for the true Church, or our true Guide; that though she always conserveth Truth, yet men come to know her by another way; and, of her, first known, afterward learn that truth, which she conserveth.

§. 29. n. 2.

But 2ly, These Protestant Marks, *viz.* *Truth of Christian doctrine, and right Administration of Sacraments*, if we could attain a certain knowledge of them another way, and needed not to learn them from the Church, yet are no infallible Mark of that Catholick Body, and Society, to which Christians may securely adhere, and rank themselves in its Communion: because such Body, when entirely professing the Christian Faith, yet still may be Schismatical; and some way guilty of dissolving the Christian Unity, as Dr. Field, amongst others, freely concedes. Who || therefore to make up (as he saith -- the Notes of the true Catholick Church c. 2. p. 31, 33) absolute, full, and perfect, and generally distinguishing this Church from all other Societies, adds to these two (the entire profession of saving Faith, and the right use of Sacraments), a third Mark, *viz.* an Union, or connexion of men in this profession, and use of these Sacraments under lawful Pastors, and Guides, appointed and authorized to direct, and lead them in the happy ways of eternal Salvation. Which Pastors lawfully authorized, he || grants those not to be, who though they have power of Order, yet have no power of Jurisdiction, neither can perform any Act thereof (qua Jurisdictio descendit Ordinatis a Superiore, as he notes in the Margin out of Bonavent.): And then, we, for the trial of the lawful Jurisdiction of such Pastors, must, leaving these other Marks of true, doctrine, and Sacraments, return to the former Rule, delivered. §. 23.

|| Of the

Church, l. 2.

c. 2. p. 31, 33.

|| l. 1. c. 14.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Application of the former Rule.

An Application of the former Propositions in a Search, which of the opposite present Churches (or Ecclesiastical Governors thereof,) is our true Guide, §.30.

Several Motives perswading, that the Roman, and other Western Churches, united with it, and the Head thereof S. Peter's Successor, are It,

1st, *Their being the very same Body with that, which Protestants grant, was 150 years ago this Guide, §.33.*

2^{ly}, *Their being that Body, to which Christians ought to submit, if the Rule delivered, Prop.12. be observed, §.35.* || §.23.

3^{ly}, *Their being that Body, that owns, and adheres to, the Definitions and Decrees of all those former Councils, which the Church of preceding Ages hath received as General, or obliging; as well in se since, as those before, the sixth, or seventh Century, §.37.*

A Perpetual being of these *Spiritual Guides* infallibly directing in necessary Controversies; and the due subjection Christians have to, and dependance on, *them*, being thus asserted in the former Propositions. The next Enquiry will be *which, or where* now is this present, visible Society, and Church, consisting of such a governing *Clergy*, and right-instructed *People*; of which learned Protestants || seem to accord with Catholics; || *See before, Prop.3. §.3.* that some where now it is; that in no age, nor at any time it ceaseth; and that it always hath been hitherto, and ever shall be, infallible in necessities.

Now *General Council*, or Representative of the present Church Catholic, united in one body, we see there is none at this present, but the same present *Governors* there are, that do constitute, and sit in, these Councils when called; only these now not united, in One Assembly, but dispersed through the several Nations of Christendom.

And the se present Governors, as to this *Western* part of Christendom, (which part indeed is by much the more considerable, the Eastern being so greatly debilitated, and consumed by the heavy yoke of *Mahometans*) are divided into two chief *Bodis*, or *Communiions*.

One

§. 31.

One body of them there is, * which adhereth to the *Prime Patriarch* of the universal Church, the Bishop of *Rome*; and so hath done from their first Christianity, acknowledging a due subordination unto him; and * which also generally admits, for its present Tenents, and Belief, the Doctrines of the *Councils*, which have been celebrated in the Church in former ages; not only those Decrees of a few of the first Councils, which stated matters of ancient Controversie concerning the *Trinity*, the *Natures*, and *Person* of our Lord, &c. Now fixed in the common Creeds; but those of all the rest since, which have stated Matters of later Debate, and many also of those Points, which are at the present disputed by Protestants, ||; * Which admits I say the Doctrines of all these Councils, even to the present times (some few only excepted, either which the *Roman Patriarch*, with the greatest part of the *West*, never approved; or which greater Councils, coming after them, have annulled) and, in particular, the Decrees of the last Council that hath been held in the Church, that of *Trent*; which was purposely assembled about, and hath decided most of, the present Protestant Controversies,

|| Disc. 1.

§. 75.

|| See Disc. 3

§. 82. &c.

To which great Body in the *West* I may join the *Eastern Churches*, as agreeing with it, and not remonstrating against its Conciliary Decrees, in most of the Doctrines questioned by Protestants ||; and All of them, in their present publick Service, and Rites, as dissonant (if not more) from the Protestant's present Doctrines, and Practices, as the *Roman* is; and I think, (all considered), of the two, the union of the Reformed more difficult, to the *Oriental Churches*,

§. 32.

Another Body or Complex of present Ecclesiastical Governors there is (that are within the profession of *Christianity*, but not allowed by the former to be within the bounds of the *Church Catholic*; (as the Church *Catholic*, all grant, is, or may be, much narrower, than *Christianity*, because all Hereticks, or Schismatics are Christians, but not Catholics), Who after having heretofore, together with the rest, in their Forefathers, held a Communion with, and acknowledged a subordination to, the *Western Patriarch*, and after having also submitted to all those latter Councils, to which the rest, till a little before the last Council, that of *Trent*, yet have since (now somewhat above a hundred years) renounced external Communion with the said Patriarch, and the Churches adhering to him; i.e. to continue therein any longer upon those terms, upon which their Fore-Fathers formerly enjoyed it; and, have withdrawn their Obedience from the former Councils, preceding their Reformation, that have been held in the Church

Church for almost this 1000 years: I mean such Councils as have been of Note, and whose Decrees are extant, and which have stated any matter of Controversie; the entire Acts of none of which they can own, and stand to: Even those two Councils† which they urge as favouring them in matters of Images, being, as they say, much corrupted. Many of them chiefly supporting, and justifying this their strange discession from their Mother the Church with a strong conceit, that she hath been, for many former Ages, turned a *Whore**; and, out of a strange imagination they have of an *Antichristian General defection* that hath hapned, not from the Church-Catholick; (though that but too apparent in *Mahometanism*) but in it, ever since the fifth, or sixth Century; or, some also say, higher; according to the time, wherein the Church's common Doctrines, or Practices began first to displease them. [Yet here, it is very observable, That, this *Fancy*, after that, by God's permission, it had had its full influence in encouraging to great an *Innovation*, and change in Religion, as would hardly have been so vigorously prosecuted upon any other Motive whatever, (*Luther*, the first Reformer, helping himself more with these words, *Antichrist*, and *Babylon*, continually dropping from his Pen, than by all his other Arguments). This *Fancy* I say, now of late begins to be, by the more wise, and learned amongst them, laid aside; After they had discovered the Mischief also it began to work in the shaking of *Episcopacy*, and several other *Necessary*, and *Apostolical* Constitutions in the Government of the Church, which the more sober among them would have to be retained still in the new Model of Religion; but the other, more zealous, to be ejected with the rest. To satisfy your self in which matter, you may view *H. Grotius* ||, and *M. Thordike's*†, and *D. Hammond's** new Schemes of Antichrist, and his Kingdom, who remove it again (with the Catholick Doctors) quite out of the Pale of the Church, and free the Reformed, of their former Fears. Which rectifying of so pernicious a Mistake of the first Reformers by a more sober posterity, well considered, may I hope in time much conduce to the Re-union of that Body, which, by this *Great Engine* of Satan chiefly, hath been heretofore so unhappily divided.]

In such a Division then, to prosecute our Enquiry, viz. who or where these *Governors* be, that are our present Guide, and that seem so much *authoriz'd* by both sides in the former Propositions.

First: If this Question had been made by any 130 years ago, there had been no difficulty to resolve it. For, that *Body*, here.

† *Conc. Const. Constantinop.*
† *Conc. Copronymus & Francoford.*
* *Rev. c. 17.*

|| *Notes on the Apocalypf.*
† *Right of the Church in the re-view, p. CLVI. &c.*
* *In his premonition concerning the Apocalypse.*

§. 33.

I.

|| §. 31. here first named ||, was then the *whole*, or the only, Catholick Church, as to the *Welt*; further than which, he; that would then have gone for *choice* of his Religion; would have fared worse ||).
 || See Disc. 3. §. 82. &c. That *Body* therefore, then, must have been conformed to, or the
 † See Disc. 1. §. 83. *whole* deserted, as indeed it was †. Now this *Body* is not changed in its *Liturgies*, in its *common Doctrines*, in its *Rites*, since that time, from what the *whole* was then: Witness the Reformation it self, which was made against these very *Doctrines*, and *Practices* that are now maintained in it ||, as *imposed* on them, before the being of the Council of *Trent*; though some † perhaps to lighten the charge of *Schism*, would fain perswade the contrary; and I wish, 187. 224. the only contest between the two present Churches were put upon the trial of this.

§. 34.

It is here apparent then, which of these two, at that time, (when as yet one of them was not) had been our lawful *Guide*, and *Mother-Church*; and easily cleared, what then were its doctrines: Of which *Guide* Protestants also testifie; That, then, it erred not in *Necessaries*. See before *Prop.* 3. §. 3. &c. — *Disc.* 1. §. 41. And that also, in all other points, Christians were to believe it, so many as could not demonstrate the contrary: See *Prop.* 9. 10. §. 20, 21. We therefore may promise the same security to our selves in following this *part* of the Catholick Church, (as the Protestants call it, though, it calls it self the *whole* still) now, as our Forefathers had in following the *whole* then. And this, resting still in this *Body*, that remains the same with what once was the *whole*, seems a security sufficient to all those, who, if this *Body* were now so entire, and so universal, as it was then, durst not now attempt a separation from the *whole*; or, to those, who are not able to demonstrate the former separation that hath been made to be just, and necessary; since the tie of Obedience to, and acquiescence in, the doctrines of these *Guides*, is dissolvable by none, save demonstrators of their Errors ||; which, among the Church's Subjects, can never be but a very small Number.

|| See Disc. 3. §. 44.

§. 35.

2.

2ly. But, besides this main Motive of submission to the first *Body* abovenamed, as our right Judge, and *Guide*, because we find it the very same with the Church Catholick that was 150 years ago: whereas the second *Body* confess themselves Churches that are since separated from the external Communion of that other, and bodies reformed from the pretended Errors and Corruptions found therein; i.e. from the Errors, which some of the *Subjects*, and of the *Flock* found then at that time in their *Guides*, and *Judges*: I say, besides this first motive, we owe the same obedience

dience to the first Body forementioned upon a second, no less Rational than the former; namely, in a conformity to that Principle laid down in the 12th. Proposition ||; whereby, in any Contradiction happening, we stand obliged to adhere to the Superior persons, and Synods, as our true Guide; and, amongst these, to a major part, as our Guide sooner, than to a Minor; By which Rule it is, that the Christian world hath been preserved hitherto from all those, which both sides agree to have been, *Heresies*; and which Rule unless we follow, we dissolve all *Government*, and all Unity of this Body of Christ, and introduce flat *Anarchy*, and *Confusion*; whilst, as for a *Monarchical* Government of the Church, Protestants will not hear of it; and, in an *Arbitrary*, or Government consisting of many, it cannot be presumed, but that there will be some Dissenters; which few Dissenters if they may be followed against the others, I ask by what Rule of Government was it, that the *Arrian*, *Eurichian*, and *Nestorian* Bishops were forced to yield; and were divested of their Pastoral authority, or guiding; any longer, by the rest of the Bishops, in the Council of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*? Now, if this Rule stand firm, and if we will be guided by the *Church-Catholick* out of Council, as we are in it; it is apparent, that this first body is a much major part of the Church-Governors joyned also with the prime Patriarch of Christianity; and so to be preferred by us before a *minor*, separated. If you would know then, which of these two present Bodies of Ecclesiasticks you are to obey out of a Council; First, do you imagine them, now, met in a Council; and next, that in this Council every one delivers, concerning things debated, that which is his present judgment when called to the Council; and this is but reasonable, since there is no likelihood of new demonstrations to be made in the Council, which already, in so much writing on all sides, these Bishops have not seen; and since *former tradition*, and not *argument*, is the chief rule of their proceedings: and no example is found in any Council past, where, in its members have concluded any thing contrary to the preceding common faith of that Age, wherein such Council was held]. Especially imagine, what the sentence of these Prelats so assembled might be concerning this particular point, *viz.* whether the former Councils that have been may have erred in their Definitions; which one point, stated negatively, ruins Protestantism. And then, if your conscience, weighing the present persuasions and practices of Christian Prelats, doth convince you, that the Votes of the one side would be very inconsiderable in it to the number of the other, as likewise that *S. Peter's Chair* (concerning

|| See in A-
chan. Apol.
Epist. Julii
- & Inno-
centii Ep.
§ 1. apud
August.
§. 36.

ing which Chair the Church's ancient Maxim hath been, *Sine Pon-
tificis Romano nihil finendum* ||) would joyn with this major part,
against the other; what remains, but that you here follow the
same Body in the Interval of a Council, which you must have fol-
lowed in the time of a Council, unless also you will reverse the
common Laws of Councils?

Note, that this is spoken of the Great Body of the *Western*
Churches contained under the *Roman* Patriarch, which doth yet by
Gods permission enjoy all the privileges of an undisturbed Ec-
clesiastical Government, & which seems by reason of its numerous
Clergy, & populacy, extent of the arms of this body, & propaga-
tion of its faith, into all the other quarters of the world, to be the
greatest part of Christianity; & likewise, that which hath bin always
the most *disputed* by reason of *S. Peters* Chair. From which for any
of the *Western* Body to make an appeal, out of these bounds, to the
present *Eastern* Churches, which are now by the great oppressor
of Christianity there hindered, and *disturbed* in the Exercise of any
such Judicature, & also much *divided* among themselves & which
have *not met* in any General Council for this eight hundred years,
save, by sending at several times their delegates into the West,
For any, I say, to make an appeal from a Church Flourishing in
Government, and discipline, in learning, and records of Anti-
quity, the *Gry* still on a *Hill*, and *Candle* on a *Candlestick*, to
seek for Votes among the *Jacobites*, *Armenians*, *Coptines*, *Ar-
menians*, *Abyssines*, or *Greek* Churches, &c. several of them
being suspected of ancient Heresies; and, if Hereticks, then no
members of the Catholick Church, appears nothing else, but the
refusal of a tryal; and avoiding the sentence of any such Guide,
and Judge, as *Gods Providence* hath afforded us; and, besides
this, is an *Appeal*, wherein could those Churches now freely de-
liver their sentence, and were now set on the Bench as this present
Judge, the Appellants can have no hopes of any success to their
cause. For that these Churches, or at least the greatest Body of
them (as is shewed elsewhere) appear to keep as great a distance
from the Reformed, as the major part of the *Western* Body
doth.

|| Disc. 3.
§. 82. & c.

§. 37.

3.

A third rationall motive for our submission to this
greater *Western* Body may be the constant adherence of It to
the *Councils*, that are extant and reputed for *General*, not
only before, but since the first six, or seven hundred years to
the times of *Reformation*: which Councils if they shall be
by any acknowledged, either for *General*, or for the most univer-

sal, that could well be convened; or, at least, that are found actually to have bin convened, (nothing, which I think, though the testimony, the *present Church* gives to them, be made no use of, the common vetacity of History will clear us; besides this, none hath any other *Councils* of an equal authority in these times to nominate, and set up against them; and those, who demolish them, do it; without erecting, or discovering to us any *better*, or any *besides*): I say, if any think meet to relie on the judgment of these *past Councils* in the present matter, these also will sufficiently evidence our present rightfull Guide, and Judge to us. For, since the *Acts*, and *Laws* of such Councils are not only of force, and obligatory, in those present times, wherein they sit, but to all future Ages; with the execution of which *Acts*, and *Decrees*, the succeeding *Pastors*, and chief Governors of the Church, in their several stations, and residences, in all following times, stand charged, till these are by an equal authority reversed, It seems clear, that in any division (happning afterward) of these *Pastors*, those are to be acknowledged our right Guides, who own, adhere to, and propagate, the Definitions and Laws of these former Councils. Now this we see, the first of these *two Bodies* doth; as the *latter* renounceth them; yet renounceth them without the producing of the patronage of any Councils at all in their stead; pulling down as it were all the Church's Castles, and Forts, (if I may call her *Councils* so) against the incursions of errours, and heresies, that have bin built in several Ages for near a thousand years; and yet shewing none other at all, for Christians, in the many points that have been disputed, to repair to, but leaving their followers, the sad Spectators of these their demolitions, quite disheartned; as dividing in the Church's judgment (so much decried by their Leaders for *gross errors*); and having yet more reason to distrust their own; and so not knowing in this case whether to betake themselves, for the settling of their Religion, and Conscience. For surely this *unerringness*, which the late Reformers have denied to those *great Bodies* of the Church, they cannot, with any reason, ascribe to those *lesser Conventions* of their own; and to requir that obedience of their Subjects to these, which they have relaxed toward the other.

CHAP.

CHAR. V.

The Pretences of such Protestants, as from the Clearness of the Scriptures make any other Infalible Guide unnecessary, removed.

The Pretended Security of those Protestants, who deny any certain, living or personal Guide, infalible in Necessaries: Affirming That all necessary matters of Faith are, even to the unlearned, clear in Scripture: and the Controversies in non-Necessaries needless to be decided, §. 38.

That all Necessaries are clear in Scripture: Because God hath left no other certain means or Guides for the knowledge of them, §. 39. n. 1.

Which Guide is infalible.

Which Guide the unlearned, in any Division, can discern from false; or, upon, and understand the decrees of such Guides better, than the Scriptures.

Or, which the Scriptures direct them so, for learning Necessaries, §. 39. n. 2.

The Reply.

1. **That Evidence of the Scriptures hath been the usual Plea of former Hereticks, in their dissenting from the Church, §. 40. n. 1.**

2. **That, as to the main and principal Articles of the Christian Faith, the sufficiency of the Rule of Scripture is not denied by Roman-Catholicks; But only the clearness thereof, as to all mens capacities, questioned: and in this respect another Guide held necessary, §. 40. n. 2.**

3. **Reply. Concerning the Clearness of Scripture.**

That some of the Controversies in Religion, since the Scriptures written, have been concerning Points necessary, §. 41.

That the more clear all Necessaries are in Scripture, the more Security Christians have in the Church's judgment, §. 42.

That there is no necessity, that all Necessaries be revealed in Scripture, §. 43.

Because it is sufficient. If the Scriptures, for the things doubtful therein, direct to these Guides, §. 43.

Sufficient, if such things be cleared to these Guides, by other Apostolical Tradition, though not by Scriptures, §. 44.

Or sufficient, if the true Sense of the Scriptures, touching these matters, be cleared to them by Tradition, §. 45.

Or,

- Or sufficient, if such sense be clear, in the Scriptures themselves (well examined, and compared) to these Guides, though not, to all others, §. 45.
4. Reply, Concerning the Necessity of another Guide.
1. That Scripture, in what it is ambiguous, cannot be a Guide, §. 46. n. 1.
2. That it is not necessary, that Christians, be in or by the Scriptures, directed to another Guide, ib. n. 2.
3. Yet that Christians are, in the Scriptures, so directed, §. 47. n. 3.
4. And may, in many points, more easily understand the sense of the decisions of these Guides, than of the Scriptures, §. 48.

THe usual security, that some Protestants of late give their Followers, in this their throwing-off the former Councils; and that Church-authority, to which, if to any, we ought to pay our Obedience, lyes in their affirming a *Non-Necessity* of any such Guide, Upon this Account [a] *That all Controversies, that arise in matters of Faith, or in matters very profitable, are so clearly decided, or determined in Scripture, that none, learned, or unlearned, using that industry, which humane prudence, and ordinary discretion (his condition considered) adviseth him to, can err in them* †. [where the unlearned seem also to be put in, lest these at least, for their ignorance, should be referred from the Scripture to a Guide, for the ending of their doubts; and using ordinary industry added, lest private men, jealous of not using their utmost industry to understand aright the Scriptures, should upon this account be perwaded, that it is safest for them to repair, and adhere, to a Guide].

Next, *That, for all other Controversies, that arise in non-Necessaries, neither is it necessary, that they should be ended. So that, as one briefly states the case, — Those places of Scripture, which contain things necessary, and wherein error were dangerous, need no infallible [Judge or] Interpreter, [or rather cannot but have every one, an infallible Interpreter of them, upon supposition of a due diligence used], because they are plain; and those that are obscure need none, because they contain not things necessary; neither is error in them dangerous. Or, as another — Of the true sense of plain texts every one may be certain, and for the obscure ones it is not necessary, every one should.* [And thus, having no living Judge, to decide controversies, they make those controversies to) much the fewer, that need deciding].

And if we here further question; why all controversies in necessities are affirmed to be clearly decided in Scripture? or, yet more, why

§. 38.

Chillingworth, p. 54.
See Chillingworth, p. 115, 92, 49.
§. 39. Pref. p. 30, &c.
— Archbishop Lawd, p. 196.
n. 3. — Stillington, R. Account, p. 149.
— Rome, 149.
— Asper, 13.
— First, Can. d. p. 89. — W. 11.
p. 44.
— Tillotson, Rule of Faith, p. 29.
§. 46.
Chillingworth, p. 59.
— Tillotson, p. 36.

why, so clearly decided there, as that even the unlearned cannot mistake in them? Mr. Chillingworth answers, they are so, because the Scripture must be, to all, sufficiently perfect, and sufficiently intelligible, in all things necessary.

|| p. 92.

And my reason hereof saith he is convincing, and demonstrative, because nothing is necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed. [Which is granted him: But he must add; plainly revealed in Scripture; and plainly there to the unlearned also; otherwise, it will not serve his purpose.]

This Proposition therefore they also maintain, that all points necessary to salvation must be plainly revealed in Scripture to learned and unlearned: and ground it on this reason; because God, who requires from all Christians even the unlearned, belief of these necessities, yet hath left them no other certain means of the knowledge thereof, save only the Scriptures. And, if it be replied here: That God hath appointed and referred them to a perpetual living Guide the Church, for the expounding and declaring to them the true sense of ambiguous Scriptures, Many things they object against this.

|| See Chillingworth p. 171
—Whitby
p. 441.

§. 39. n. 2.

[1.] 1st, they earnestly dispute; that this Guide the Church; that they are referred to, is not infallible, but that their's, the Holy Scripture, the Bible, is so: And, that this latter, to which they repair, affords them much more security, than those other Guides to whom the Roman Party directs; especially, than those particular Pastours, with consulting of whom most are content.

|| See D. Stillingfleet p. 101
508, &c.

|| Chillingworth p. 93.
Whitby p. 430, &c.

[2.] 2^{dly}, they ask many questions about such Guide (as they conceive, unanswerable.) How, in a division of these living Guides, the unlearned may come to know, which are the right; and which, of several, is the true Church? Or, this found, how come to know, what are her definitions, and decrees? Or next, what the sense of these decrees, &c? See many of them collected in §. 86. contending, that the unlearned, in any such division of Guides, have no certain means to know the true from the false; nor the sense of their definitions more easily, than the sense of the Scriptures.

|| See M. Chillingworth p. 61, 104, 171.

—Stillingfleet repairs to these Guides, for learning of them. And Rat. Accon. again, by reason of the divisions happening among these Guides, (well fore-seen by him); he would further have told them in the

—Answ. to
Princ. conf. p. 112, 113.

[3.] 3^{dly} Lastly they say; [That, if God had left Christians in all Ages to learn Necessaries from these other Guides he would at least, in the Scriptures, have directed Christians to repair to these Guides, for learning of them.] And Rat. Accon. again, by reason of the divisions happening among these Guides, (well fore-seen by him); he would further have told them in the Scriptures, what party, in such a case, they ought to follow, and adhere to; as, that they should always adhere to the Church of Rome; or, to the Church of Christ; or to the most General Councils; and so on dissenting waters here, to the papal stream, &c. And indeed

indeed this assertion, that God hath left no other, *certain, or sufficient*, means to any sort of Christians, since the Apostles times, whereby to attain the knowledge of *necessaries* to salvation, save only the *Scriptures*, seems to be the main pillar, on which Mr. Chillingworth, and his followers sustain the Protestant Religion, and the Reformation ||

See Chillingworth's pref. §. 30. &c. comp. c. 2. §. 155, 156.

Before I return an answer to these, I have two things to note to you: 1st, That the devolving the decision of Controversies, not upon the *sufficiency* only, but upon the *clearness*, of the rule of *Scripture*, and declining any constant adhesion to the Church's judgment in Exposition of it, seems not a little prejudicial to the Protestants cause; in that this is observed of old by *Tertullian, Austin, Vincentius Lirinensis*, and other Fathers ||, to have bin the way, that all former *heresies* have taken, declining the Church and its Tradition, and pretending the *Scriptures* as the support of their Doctrines ||

§. 40. n. 1.

1.

Of the old *Hereticks*, thus *Vincentius Lirinensis* 222. contra *Maxim.* *Sive apud suos frues alienos, &c. nihil unquam pete de suis* *præferunt, quod non etiam Scriptura verbis adumbrare contetur. Le-* *ge Pauli Samosatensis, opuscula, Priscilliani, Eunomii, Joviniani, re-* *liquarumque pestium; carnales in finem Exemplorum congeriem; prope* *nullam inquit paginam, qua non novi, aut veteris testamenti senten-* *tia fugata, & solvatur sit.* Then enquiring in this case || — *quomodo in* *Scripturis sanctis Catholici homines veritatem a falsitate* *discernunt?* He answers || — *Hoc scilicet facere magnopere cura-* *bunt, ut divinum Canonem, secundum universalis Ecclesie Traditiones & juxta Catholici dogmatis regulas, interpretentur.* ||

Tertull. de præscript. adv. Heret. Aug. Ep.

Contra Hæres. 3. c. 38.

And the same thing is also observable in that new-revived, most dangerous, Heresie of Socinianism; which draws up for it self, against Church-authority, much-what the same Plea, as is here above made by these Protestants: some part of it, that you may compare them, I have transcribed you here out of *Volkelius*, a little contracted.

There then he saith, — *Qua de fide in Christum statuenda sunt, ex sacris literis patere. Charitatem quoque que in sacris literis ita describam esse, ut quicumque eam ex animo colere, mentemque advertere velit, ignorare non possit, quid sibi sit in omnibus visis partibus sequendum; præsertim si sapientiam a Deo petat, quam ille nemini denegat.* Again — *Deum qui religionem Christianam usque ad mundi finem vigere voluit, quæque etiam, tale aliquod perpetuo extare, unde ea, quatenus omnino ad salutem est necessarium, cognosci indubitato possit; At nihil tale extare, præter sacras literas. Nam si dicat, Ecclesiam esse, unde ea cognitio semper*

peti

peti possit: primum statuendum tibi erit, Deum etiam decrevisse, ut Ecclesia vera (falsa enim ad eam rem inepta est) semper usque ad mundi finem extet.—Sed, ut Ecclesia vera extet, a qua omnes salutaris veritatis notitiam indubitato petere queant, requiritur, ut homines complures coetum aliquem, qui in omnium oculis incurrat, constituant.—At non est, quod quis certam aliquam Ecclesiam hoc privilegio a Deo donatam esse contendat, ut fide excidere nequeat. Deinde non posse Ecclesiam veram certo cognosci nisi prius cognoscatur, qua sit salutaris Christi doctrina—præterea id ipsum saltem debuisse alicubi in sacris literis clare ac perspicue scriptum extare, debere ab Ecclesia peti omnia, quæ ad salutem sciens sunt necessaria; & quænam ea sit Ecclesia, ac unde debeat cognosci, clare describi, ne quis in ea cognoscenda facile errare possit. Nam si quippiam scriptum fuisset necessarium, hoc sane fuisset, sine quo reliqua omnia, quæ scripta sunt, nihil, aut parum admodum prodesse.—Denique eam Ecclesiam, quam isti [Pontificii] perpetuo extitisse volunt, constare, multis in rebus, atque adeo in iis quoque, quæ ad salutem sunt necessariae, gravissime errare, [Things usually pleaded by Mr. Chillingworth and his followers, but whether borrowed from these I can say

|| See below, nothing ||] Thus the Socinians lay the platform of their Religion :
 §. 47. n. 1. and when the Protestants, for confuting their error, urge Fathers,
 || See Simple and Church-authority against them, they reply, That they have
 de Filio learnt this from them, to receive nothing besides Scripture, and to
 Dei, & S. neglect the Fathers ||. Mean-while; I acknowledge frequent
 Spiritu. Appeals of the Fathers, in Controversies of Religion, to the trial
 Præfat. of the Holy Scriptures and that also sometimes, waving Church-
 || See S. Authority ||, but such Appeal never made in opposition to Church-
 fin contra authority, former, or present. Their great humility (which
 Maximim also kept them Orthodox) hindered them from presuming this;
 num 1. 3. and, had any of them done it, posterity would not have stiled him
 c. 14. a Father.

§. 40. n. 2.

2.

The second thing I would mind you of is; That, as for the sufficiency, or intireness of the Scriptures, for the containing all those points of faith, that are simply necessary of all persons to be believed for attaining salvation, Roman Catholicks deny it not; but only deny such a clearness of Scripture, in some of those, as Christians cannot mistake, or pervert. Catholicks contend indeed, that there are several things necessary to be believed by Christians, according as the Church, out of Apostolical Tradition, hath or shall declare and propose them, (as, touching the Government of the Church: several Functions of the Clergy; Administration of the Sacraments, and some other sacred Ceremonies; and

and particularly concerning the *Canon of the Scriptures*); which are not contained in the Scriptures, at least, as to the clear mention therein of all those appertinents, which, yet, have bin ever observed in the Church. And touching the obligation of believing, and due observing of several of these *Traditions*, as descending from the Apostles, learned Protestants also agree with them || and in particular, concerning the believing of the *Canon* || See Dr. of Scripture, though it be a thing not contained in Scripture. See *Field of the Mr. Chillingworths Confession* p. 55. || where he saith, — *That Church, l. 4. when Protestants affirm against Papists, that Scripture is a perfect c. 20. — Dr. Rule of faith, their meaning is not, that by Scripture all things absolutely may be proved, which are to be believed, For it can never be proved by Scripture to a Gain-sayer, that there is a God, or that theseried, §. 19. Book called Scripture is the Word of God. For he that will deny these — Reasons of Assertions, when they are spoken, will believe them never a whit the the Univer-* more, because you can shew them written: But their meaning is; that *say of Ox-* the Scripture to them, that presuppose it divine, and a *Rule of faith* ford against (as Papists and Protestants do), contains all the material objects of the Cove- faith; is a compleat, and total, and not only an imperfect, and a *nant, 1647.* partial, Rule. Where in saying, all material objects of faith, he p. 2. means only all other, after these that there is a God, And that || See also these Scriptures are his word, presupposed, and pre-believed. p. 114. But though (I say) Catholicks maintain several Credends, that are not expressed in Scriptures, necessary to be believed, and observed by Christians, after the Churches *Proposal* of them, as *Tradition Apostolical*, amongst which is the *Canon of Scripture*; Yet they willingly concede, that all such points of faith as are simply necessary for attaining salvation, and as ought explicitly by all men to be known in order thereto, either *ratione medii*, or *per se ipso*, (as the Doctrines collected in the three Creeds; the *Common Precepts of manners*, and of the more necessary *Sacraments*, &c.) are contained in the Scriptures; contained therein, either in the *Conclusion* it self; or in the *principles*, from whence it is necessarily deduced. [See *Bellarmino de verbo Dei non scripto*, l. 4. cap. 11. — *Ita omnia scripta sunt ab Apostolis, qua sunt omnibus simpliciter necessaria ad salutem* Stapleton *Relect. Princip. Doctrina fidei Controvers. §. 9. 5. art. — Doctrinam fidei ab omnibus, & singulis explicite credendam, omnem, aut fere omnem, script commendarunt Apostoli.* — The main and substantiall Points of our faith (saith F. Fisher in Bishop White, p. 12.) are believed to be Apostolical, because they are written in Scripture, S. Thom. 22. q. 1. art. 9. ad primum, art. 10. ad primum. — In *Doctrina Christi, & Apostolorum* [he means scripta] *veritas fidei est sufficienter explicata*

explicata; sed, quia perversi homines Scripturas pervertant, ideo necessaria fuit temporibus precedentibus explicatio fidei contra insurgentes errores. And 1b. q. 5. A. 3. — Omnibus Articulis fidei inhaeret Fides propter unum medium. *scilicet* propter veritatem primam propositam nobis in Scripturis, secundum doctrinam Ecclesiae, sane intelligendis. See several Authorities to this purpose collected by Fr. a S. Clara in *System. Fidei*, c. 7. ☐ Therefore the Church, from time to time, defining any thing concerning such points, defines it out of the Revelations made in Scripture. And the chief Tradition, the necessity and benefit of which is pretended by the Church, is not the delivering of any additional doctrines, descended from the Apostles's times extra Scripturas, i. e. such doctrines, as have not their foundation at least in Scripture; but is the preserving, and delivering of the primitive sense, and Church-explication of that which is written in the Scriptures, but many times not there written so clearly. (which traditive sense of the Church you may find made use of against Arianisme in the first Council of Nice ||) — Or, as Dr. Field — This Tradition is that form of Christian doctrine, and Explication of the several parts thereof, which the first Christians, receiving of the same Apostles that delivered to them the Scriptures, commended to posterity. Thus he. This then being the Tradition, that is chiefly vindicated by the Roman Church, it is not the deficiency of Scripture, as to all the main, and prime, and universally necessary-to-be-known, Articles of faith, (as if there were any necessity, that these be supplied, and compleated with other not written traditional Doctrines of Faith) that Catholicks do question: but such a non-clearness of Scriptures (for several of these points) as that they may be mis-understood, (which non-clearness of them infers a necessity of making use of the Church's tradition for a true exposition and sense), is the thing that they assert: and wonder, that, after the appearance of so many grievous Heresies, any should deny. For, as to the Scriptures containing all the chief, and material Points of a Christian's belief; what Article of Faith is there, except that concerning the Canon of Scripture; (which, Protestants also grant, cannot be learnt out of Scripture;) and excepting those Practicals wherein, the Church only requiring a Belief of the Lawfulness of them, it is enough, if they cannot be shewed to be against Scripture; I say, what Speculative Article of Faith is there, for which Catholicks rest merely on unwritten Tradition; and do not, for it, alledge Scripture; I mean, even that Canon of Scripture, which Protestants allow?

|| See Theod.
Hist. l. 1.
c. 8.
|| Of the
Church,
p. 375.

|| 14. §. 10.

☐ A thing observed also by Dr. Field ||, but too much extended,

extended.—*This is so clear (saith he); That there is no matter of Faith* ['tis granted, no principal point thereof] *delivered by bare, and only Tradition; that, therein, the Romanists contrary themselves, endeavouring to prove by Scripture the same things they pretend to hold by Tradition; as we shall find, if we run through the things questioned between them and us, [they contrary not themselves, in their holding several things to be delivered clearly by Tradition, which are also, but obscurely, or more evadably, contained in the words of Scripture]*

Again ||—*So that for masters of Faith (saith || Ib. p. 377. he) we may conclude, according to the judgment of the best, and most learned, of our Adversaries themselves; that there is nothing to be believed, which is not either expressly contained in Scripture, or at least by necessary consequence, from thence, and by other things evident in the light of Nature, or in the matter of Fact, to be concluded.*

Thus he. □

I say then; not this, whether the main, or if you will, the entire, body of the Christian Faith, as to all points necessary by all to be explicitly believed, be contained there; but this; whether so clearly, that the unlearned, using a right diligence, cannot therein mistake, or do not need therein another Guide, is the thing here contested.

For a particular Reply then to what is here said. To a. (§. 38.) 1st. I ask; if all Necessaries be clearly revealed, and all necessary Controversies clearly decided, in Scripture, even to the unlearned, how have Controversies in Necessaries (as, those concerning the Trinity, our Lord's Deity, and Humanity, &c.) in several Ages arose, and gained many Followers? Here, will they say; that such Controversies, are not in Necessaries? How then came the first General Councils (extolled by Protestants) to put them in the Creed, or to exact Assent to them upon Anathema; which Councils Protestants affirm in non-necessaries fallible, and in what they are fallible, unjustly imposing Assent? Or will they say, that these Controversies are in Necessaries; and that the unlearned may easily discern, and decide them; and that, not by Tradition, but only, Scripture? How happened it then, that heretofore, so many, (learned, unlearned), when forsaking the Church's guidance, erred in them? But if they say, this hapned for want of a due diligence in the search of the Scriptures: thus they leave men in great perplexity, and doubt, whether they have sufficiently searched, and whether the Scripture is not plain in it self (and only obscure to them through their

§. 41.

R. to a.

1.

negligent search); and so, whether the point perhaps may not be a necessary. Thus an illiterate Christian, not discerning from clear Scripture, whether *Socinianisme*, or *Anti-Socinianisme*, be the Catholick Faith, which he is very solicitous to live, and die in; and consulting these Divines concerning it, they tell him, there is no other director left him, beside Scripture, whose Judgment he may securely follow (the judgment of the Church, or Councils, here, being waved by them, because this judgment allowed, or authorized, will infer the Belief of some other points, which they approve not); Only this satisfaction they seem to leave him, that if neither side be clear to him in Scripture, neither much matters it, which side he holds for truth; For God, say they, hath there, clearly, revealed all necessities. But he enquiring further; whether these Divines do not firmly believe *Anti-Socinianism*? and also ground their Faith of this upon the *Clearness* of Scripture in it? And then: since it appears to them clear in Scripture, how they know, but that it may be a necessary truth; and so his salvation ruined, if he believe the contrary? Here, what they can answer that will not more perplex him, I see not. Since, so long as he may, possibly, fail in a *due diligence*, though only required according to his condition, he cannot be satisfied, whether the point, to every other due Searcher, be not clear in Scripture; and also be not a *Necessary*. Nor yet will they allow him any other certain Director in it, but the same Scripture, which appears to him ambiguous.

|| *Rat. Ac-*
count. p. 58.

Hear what Dr. *Stillingfleet* interposeth in this matter—
It seems reasonable (saith he ||) that, because *Art.* and *Subtlety* may be used by such, who seek to pervert the Catholick Doctrine, and to wrest the plain places of Scripture, which deliver it, so far from their proper meaning, that very few ordinary capacities may be able to clear themselves of such *Mists*; as are cast before their eyes; the sense of the Catholick Church in succeeding ages may be a very useful way [But, why not a necessary way, I pray, upon the former supposal?] for us to embrace the true sense of Scripture, especially in the great Articles of the Christian Faith. As for instance, in the Doctrine of the Deity of Christ, or the Trinity. [Therefore you see, in the greatest Articles, Scriptures confessed not so plain, especially to the unlearned, and ordinary capacities but that the Churches explication may be usefull (may not I say, needfull?) to us.

§. 42.

2.

ly, If all Necessaries so clearly revealed in Scripture; may we not so much the more securely, and certainly rely on the judgment of our *Ecclesiastical Guides*, and Teachers in them;

10

to whom they must needs be as, or more, plain, than to us; *On their judgment*, especially when assembled in a General Council; on it, for these *Necessaries* at least.

It seems, no; and that when this question is asked, the case is now altered. Even now; *Necessaries* were so plain in Scripture, as the unlearned, using ordinary diligence, could not mistake in them: Now, *Necessaries* are not so plain in Scripture, but that a General Council, as to the major part of them (the highest Authority by which the Church Catholick can directus), at least, if such Council not in their sense universally accepted, (for this Exception is put in by the more moderate ||) may mistake in them so far, as that the un- *See Disc. 1. §. 22. &c.* learned have, even for these *Necessaries*, no security to rely on their judgment. — *I must tell you* (saith Mr. Chillingworth to F. Knor ||) *you are too bold in taking that, which no man grants you; ||* p. 150. *that the Church is an infallible Director in Fundamentals [or Necessaries].*

Now this also he was (considering his Engagement) forced to say; and gives the reason that made him say so (I suppose for satisfying his own Party, rather than his Adversary) in the words following. — *For* (saith he) *if she were so; then must we not only learn Fundamentals of her; but also learn of her, what is fundamental, and take all for fundamental, which she delivers to be such.* And what harm in it, say I, if you did? But this, he well saw, would have destroyed the Reformation; which was contrary to the Doctrines, which the publick *Director*, that was then in being, delivered. But if these *Necessaries*, at the last, are not so few, or so plain in Scripture, but that the judgment of the Church-Guides, even when met, in their supreme Consults, may err in them, will he allow us then to follow some other's judgment that is in these points fallible? If so, why not follow theirs? But if not so; whose judgment will he direct us to, that shall less err than these Guides; or, that shall certainly not err, in the understanding of these plain Scriptures, wherein these Guides mistake? Methinks he should * forbear here to name to us *our own* Judgment; even when we unlearned too; and yet none else can he name: And * much more forbear here to alledge *Passion, Faction, Interest, &c.* as great Blinders of this publick judgment, unless he could first shew the *private* not at all, or less, liable to them; which corrupters of a clear understanding seem indeed more incident to persons of a lower rank, and that have much relation to, and dependance on, others; and therefore what more common, than, for avoiding such Interest and faction, to make Appeals from inferior, to a more general judgment, as expecting, in the most general, the most impartial dealing? And what private person,

person can we produce, that doth not range himself with some party; and that hath not, in matters controverted, a strong *secular Interest* for one side to be truth, rather than the other, according to the Church, and State, he lives in?

§. 43.

3.

But 3ly As it is necessary, that God, some way, or other, do *clearly* reveal to all, even the unlearned, using their due Industry, that which he requires *necessarily* to be believed by them; so it is not consequent at all, that God should do this, to them (as to every thing necessary), in the *Scriptures*.

1.

First; Because God cannot be said to have been *deficient* in a competent revelation of Necessaries to all men, if he hath left (as indeed he hath) sufficient evidence, and clearness in the *Scriptures* (that are first generally agreed on to be his Word), to every man *rightly* using his private judgment or common reason, as to one point only; viz. this: *That it is his divine Will, that private men, for all those Scriptures, the sense whereof is any way dubious, or controverted, should constantly be guided by, and adhere to, the judgment of those spiritual Superiors, that he hath set over them; and, in any division of these, should still hold to the Superiors among these Superiors, according to the Subordinations by him established amongst them.* For thus we see, after a Christian's private judgment or common reason used only in one point, for all other points private judgment is now discharged; and in stead thereof, obedience to *Authority* takes place, so far as it in the stating of any point, thinks fit to restrain, therein, other mens Liberty of Opinion. The testimony of which Church-authority, as a thing clearly demonstrated and ratified by the *Scriptures*, S. *Austin*, in more difficult matters of Controversie, often appealed to. See *Disc. 3. §. 78.* — *Puto (saith he) si aliquis Sapiens extitisset, cui Dominus Iesus Christus testimonium perhibet [that we should be directed by his judgment]: & de hac questione consulereur a nobis; nullo modo dubitare deberemus id facere quod ille dixisset; ne non tam ipsi, quam Domino Iesu Christo, cuius testimonio commendatur, repugnare iudicaretur. Perhibet autem testimonium Christus Ecclesie suae.* And so this, (which is so often retorted by Protestants,) that Catholicks also are forced to allow to Christians the necessary use of their private Judgment, will be verified only in this one point, *The Choice, or the discerning, of their Guide*; whereas the Protestants make it necessary for *all* Points; and who sees not a vast difference between these two, (for the hazard which a Christian incurs therein,) The being, in *all controverted matters* of Religion, and sense of *Scriptures*, merely cast up-

en

on his own reason, and skill, to steer himself aright therein, And
 * The being left to this only in *one* matter; and that one, (as Catholics contend,) in the Scriptures very clear; after which, examined, and judged by him, all the rest, wherein he may want a resolution, are, without his further solicitude, to be judged for him, by another. So there is a great difference, when a person falls sick, between his being left to the use of his private judgment in making choice of a *Physician*, according to certain Rules prescribed unto him by a wise, and experienced man in that behalf; and then, this once done, submitting himself afterward to this Physician in all things, that he shall prescribe for his cure; and between this sick person's undertaking, by *Hippocrates* his Aphorisms, or other Physick Books, to prescribe all particular Remedies to himself, upon this reasoning: that if his private judgment serves for directing Him in the one, making choice of a Physician; why not in all the other, fit Medicines for his Disease? Which Argument is only good, where all the Objects, about which our judgment is exercised, are equally easie, and clear, to it: And therefore, unconsequently seems that Question to be asked ||—[If the Scripture may, and must decide one Point, that of the Church, why may it not as well all the rest?] If the Scripture be not in all other Points equally clear, and not mistakable. This then is one way of sufficient Revelation, besides Mr. *Chillingworth's* way [I mean, that, of all necessary Truths there being clearly revealed in Scripture): viz. a sufficient Revelation of one point, in Scripture, concerning that Guide; from whom we may securely learn all the other points, not clear to us in Scripture.

2ly, Because God, besides, and before, the New-Testament Scriptures, left these doctrines sufficiently revealed to the then-appointed Ecclesiastical Guides; from whom both the present people, and the future successors of these Guides, both were, and might rationally know they were, to learn them; and so, had there been no Scriptures, might to this day by *their Tradition* have learned them sufficiently for their Salvation. This is a second way then of sufficient Revelation, besides, or without, that in Scripture: viz. All necessary Truth, since the penning of the Scriptures, in the same manner still manifested clearly to, and so delivered clearly by the Church-Guides, as they were manifested to and delivered by them, before Scripture.

3ly, Because, as all the Christian Doctrines might have been delivered clearly enough by Tradition before the writing of the

§. 44.
2.

3.

the New-Testament Scriptures, so, *the true meaning* of some part of the same *Scripture* might, after the writing thereof, have been clearly enough delivered by the same Tradition, and by the first Scripture-Expositors, to the Christian people that were then, and so to Posterity, though mean-while the Letter of such Scripture doth not so necessarily enforce this *traditive* sense, as not to be possibly, or sometimes probably, capable of another. This is a third way of sufficient Revelation: *viz.* by the clear descending Tradition of the *sense* of those Scriptures, which are in their *Letter* ambiguous.

§. 45.

4.

But 4ly, Supposing it needful, that all such Necessaries must be *clearly* revealed in the *Letter* of Scripture; yet is this sufficient, to save God's proceedings from tyranny, if that they be with sufficient clearness revealed therein to the *Church-Guides alone*, and to the *Learned*, that diligently reade, and compare the Scriptures together, and use the helps of the comparings, and comments of others; and so the *illiterate* people be remitted by God, in all ages, to learn these Necessaries from their *Guides*. This is a fourth way of sufficient Revelation of Necessaries, *i. e.* a revelation of them in Scripture, such as must be clear to the *Church-Guides*; in stead of that other revelation, there, of Mr. *Chillingworth's*; such as must be clear to *all*.

§. 46. n. 1.

R. to §.

To § (§. 39. n. 2.) I answer, that, Protestants much misrepresent and mis-propose the case between them and Catholicks in this matter. That the Bible or Holy Scriptures are equally acknowledged an all-true, certain, and infallible Rule, for the guidance of Christians, by both parties; and where the sense thereof (which sense, and not the letter only, is God's Word) is evident, and not controverted (as in many points it is clear), is equally acquiesced-in, as held intallible, by both sides. But where the true sense of this common Rule happens to be disputed, and brought into question, and so there is need of some other Guide to shew, which sense is the right, here the Guide, which Protestants direct men to, is not the certain and infallible Scripture which thing they pretend; How can it, when the sense of this Scripture is the thing controverted? But indeed is, in the last place, every mans *own judgment*, or *Reason*, of two senses taking that he thinks truer; And the *Guide*, which the Roman doctrine directs men to, is, their *spiritual Superiours*, to whom the Exposition of the *Scriptures* is committed; and, in the last place, the most supreme Council of them. Where also *ist*, that supreme

supreme Guide, whom all the particular Guides of Catholicks, whenever consulted, hold themselves obliged to follow, is affirmed in all its Definitions concerning Necessaries to be infallible. And 2ly, since such its Definitions are only in things, in which the sense of Scripture is controverted, it may be presumed, that the sense of the same Definitions is, to all private persons more intelligible and plain, than those Scriptures be in themselves, that are explained by them. And 3ly, this living Guide from time to time as any further doubt ariseth, can render it self still more intelligible, which the Rule of Scripture cannot. And 4ly, the consulting here also of private Pastors affords a sufficient security, where these hold themselves obliged in every thing strictly to adhere to the Definitions of the Church, as the Roman Pastors do; But not so the Reformed.

To γ. See many of these Questions solved, *Disc. 3. §. 86.* *R. to γ.*
and, concerning our understanding the sense of the Church's Definition better, than the sense of Scriptures, See below, §. 48. &c.

To δ. 1st, It is not necessary, that God should direct *§. 46. n. 2.*
Christians in this matter, what Guides they should always follow *R. to δ.*
and obey, by the Scriptures; since they were sufficiently directed herein, also, before the Scriptures; (I mean, before the writing of those of the New Testament); and, since Christians might be sufficiently assured, from those persons who were sent by our Lord to teach them Christianity, in this point also, *that they were sent to teach them.*

But 2ly, It is maintained that God in the Scriptures hath done this; and * hath told us || — *That, he hath set these Guides in the Church, for the edifying, and perfecting thereof; and for this in particular, that the Church should not be tossed to, and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine.* [with which Winds of contrary Doctrines, the Subjects of the Church, as Experience shews, from age to age, would have been grievously shaken, and dissipated, but that these *Gouverners*, from time to time, by stating her Doctrines, have preserved her Children from it]. And * hath told us again || — *That, the unlearned wrest some of the Scriptures* [that are plain, it seems, to the Learned, in that these wrestlers are the *unlearned*,] *to their own damnation; [and therefore these are such Scriptures also, as speak concerning Necessaries].* And * hath therefore given us a charge, *to obey these guides, to whom is committed the Care of our Souls, and so follow their faith* || *2 Pet. 3. 16.*
And declared — *that he, that heareth them, heareth him* †; and † *Luk. 10.*
that

|| Mat. 18.

17, 20.

† Mat. 18. 17

|| Answ. to
Prin. consid.
p. 196.

that he will be with them to the end of the world: especially when gathered together ||; and would have the refractory to them excommunicated †. And see the many Texts of Scripture urged for the promised divine assistance of these Guides, so, that in necessities they shall never mislead their Subjects, in 1. Disc. §. 7. &c. And whereas it is here replied by Protestants, that these Scriptures, alledged for the duty of Christians to repair to such a Judge for deciding their Controversies in Religion, are not clear, but the most doubtful and controverted of any others, whenas, this being a matter of the greatest necessity, the evidence thereof in Scripture ought to be so much more conspicuous: Of the true meaning of which places. (saith Dr. Skillingfleet ||) I would fain understand by what means I may come to be certain, and to finde out the sense of them? Must I do it only by an infallible Guide? But that is the thing I am now seeking for, and I must not suppose that which I am to prove. [But] if I may be certain, without supposing such an infallible Guide, of the meaning of these very doubtful and controverted places; then why may I not by the same way of proceeding arrive at the certainty of any other less doubtful and obscure places? Thus He, Thus others. To which I answer; That our Lord in these Scriptures hath delivered his minde plainly and clearly enough concerning this matter in the sense wherein Tradition hath ever understood them; so plainly, as, that upon all controversies, concerning the dubious sense of Scriptures, thought necessary to be decided, the Church of God *de facto* hath repaired to these Judges as believed infallible in all Necessaries, as by the testimony of Tradition, so upon the account of this promised Divine assistance in Scripture, and of their being delegated by our Lord to this end among others, for keeping the Church-Catholick always in One faith, and One body. And by these Judges the Church hath ever understood the supreme Governours and Pastors assembled in a lawful General Council; the first of which was that A.D. 325. convened about settling the Controversie concerning Mosaiscal Ceremonies. Which Fathers of the Church also so assembled, as acknowledging and owning their Infallibility in all Necessaries from the same Divine promises made in Scripture, have accordingly from time to time determined and stated necessary Controversies even in the highest points, of the Trinity, and of the Humanity of our Lord; and some of these their Decisions, that were thought more necessary to be of all men explicitly known, they have inserted also into the common Church-Creeds, and have enjoined to all the members of Christ the belief of them as of Articles of their faith contained in the Scriptures, according to the true and genuine sense thereof declared by

by them: Witness the points inserted by these Councils in the *Athanasian Creed*. And accordingly the Doctrine of these Councils the Church hath alledged as certain and infallible, against Hereticks. This use and practice of the Church from the beginning is apparent and notoriously known; and therefore this apparent also, against the new interpretations of a contrary-interested party, that both the Church-diffusive, and these Councils, have always thus understood our Lords Promises in Scripture, as securing for ever, the Infallibility in Necessaries of these Supreme Ecclesiastical Courts, and the applications made to their Tribunal for deciding them; and any obscurity in the Letter of any of these Scriptures (were there some) This Tradition hath cleared to us, as to the sense.

Next to *. Where they say: That God foreseeing, that Divisions would happen among these Guides, would have told us in the Scriptures, which, in such case, among the several Parties of them, we ought always to follow, and adhere to: As: that we should adhere to the Church of Rome; to the Vicar of Christ; to the most General Councils, and, in dissenting Votes, to the Major part thereof, &c. [] To which purpose are those words of Mr. Chillingworth ||—

If our Saviour, the King of Heaven, had intended that all Controversies in Religion should be, by some visible Judge, finally determined; who can doubt, but in plain terms he would have expressed himself about this matter? He would have said plainly: The Bishop of Rome I have appointed to decide all emergent Controversies. For, that our Saviour designed the Bishop of Rome [I add, or a General Council] to this Office, and yet would not say so, nor cause it to be written ad rei memoriam by any of the Evangelists, or Apostles, so much as once; but leave it to be drawn out of uncertain Principles, by 13, or 14 more uncertain Consequences, He that can believe it, let him. || p. 61.

And p. 104. He saith— *It would have been infinitely beneficial to the Church, perhaps as much as all the rest of the Bible, that in some Book of Scripture, which was to be undoubtedly received, this one Proposition had been set down in terms, The Bishops of Rome, with their Adherents, shall always be the Guides of Faith, &c.*

And p. 171. he argues thus— *Seeing God doth nothing in vain; and seeing it had been in vain, to appoint a Judge of Controversies, and not to tell us so plainly who it is; and seeing (lastly) he hath not told us plainly; no not at all, who it is; is it not evident, he hath appointed none?—See the same thing urged by Dr. Stillingfleet, Rat. Account, p. 465. and Answer, to Princ. consid. p. 113.*

§. 47. n. 2.

1.

translated only out of the *Socinian* Books, before, §. 40. n. 1. □

To this *iff*, I answer: That *negative* arguing from *Scripture*, such as this, [a thing of so great concernment to all Christians, if it were true, would have bin clearly expressed therein, therefore it is not true,] as it is very plausible, and much used, especially against *Church-authority*; so is it very fallacious: by which the more *Orthodox* party of *Protestants* also have suffered much from several *Sects*. Whenas it cannot be denied; that there are many things, that are granted most true, and, of most high concernment, which yet are, for those excellent ends of Gods infinite wisdom which we cannot fully discern, not so clearly expressed there, for preventing disputes, as they might have been.

|| In *Johan.*
Tract. 27.

Our *Saviours* Sermon made (partly, at least) concerning the *Eucharist*, (amply set down in the 6th. of *S. John*, and therefore perhaps mention of the *Eucharist* omitted afterward by that Evangelist in the Story of his passion) was delivered by him in some expressions so obscure, as that (as *St. Austin* observes) not only his enemies, the blinded Jews, but his own *disciples* misunderstood it, and some of them deserted him upon it, calling it *durus Sermo*: and yet saith that Father || — *Sic oportebat, ut diceretur, quod non ab omnibus intelligeretur*. And what contentions, and also persecutions, think we, might a declaration of the abrogation of *Circumcision*, and the *Mosaical Ceremonies* have saved in the *Apostl's* times, if it had been any where delivered expressly by our Lord, (who well foresaw those troubles), in the Gospel he preached? Or what contentions would the *Athanasian Creed* have prevented in the times that followed, had it been written *verbatim* in one of *S. Pauls* Epistles; or had the points of *modern Controversie* bin set down, there, in as expresse terms, as they are in a *Protestant-Catechism*, in the 39. *Articles*, or in the *Council of Trent*. If

|| Cor. 1. 23.

25. we will give humane wisdom (in respect of which *God's Wisdom* is often thought *foolishness*) liberty to devise what is best, or fittest, had it not bin much more to purpose for *Conversion* of the *Jews* to Christianity, that our Lord, upon his Resurrection, should have openly manifested himself to all the Nation, at the great Festival, on the top of the Temple, with a *Tropee* of victory in his hands? And, for the salvation of mankind (*God-willing, that all should be saved*), had it not been better to have made the devil at first close prisoner, and prevented the temptation of *Eve*, and fall of *Adam*? Hear *Mr. Chillingworth* himself, where it concerned him, reprove the folly of such arguing: — *In humane*

|| p. 103.

reason (saith he ||) *it were incomparably more fit, and useful, for the decision*

decision of Controversies, that the Apostles Successors should do Miracles; with you now conclude they have the Gift of doing Miracles?—It had been most requisite (one would think) that the Copies if the Bibles should have been preserved free from variety of reading, which makes men very uncertain in many places, which is the Word of God, and which is the error, and presumption of man; and yet, we see, God hath not thought fit so to provide for us. Who can conceive, but that an Apostolick Interpretation of all the difficult places of Scripture, would have bin strangely beneficial to the Church, especially there being such danger in mistaking the sense of them, as is by you pretended, &c. And yet we see God hath not so ordered the matter. Thus Mr. Chillingworth.

Supposing then, that a General Council, or the Bishop of the prime Apostolick See were constituted by God the Supreme and Final Judge of Controversies in Religion, and of all Appeals from inferior Ecclesiastical Courts: yet Gods wisdom might think meet not to register this, in these, or the like short and clear, expressions, in Scripture, for many excellent reasons: tending to the manifestation of his greater glory, who makes darkness as well as light, to bring light out of darkness; and leaves many arguments of contradiction to human reason, the more to shew the power of the operation of his grace; who discloseth the things belonging to our salvation, sometimes with more, sometimes with less, evidence, (yet this always sufficient), for the necessary preserving of truth, on the one side; and for the exercise, and greater merit of faith, on the other.

But 2ly, to come closer to the matter in hand. God hath in the Scriptures not only left to Christians a General Command of following their Guides, but also sufficiently directed them to know, in any division of these Ecclesiastical Guides, which are those they ought to follow, in that, he, being in all things the Author not of confusion, but of order, and peace, hath not left these Guides in the Church without a due subordination, from the very first, and Apostolical, times; and also hath authorized the Church-Governors, to make afterwards such wholesome laws, for the Regency, peace, and unity thereof, as do justly, and unappealably, oblige all inferiors, and subjects. Hence there is not wanting both Precept and Example sufficient, both in the Holy Scriptures, and primitive, Church-constitutions, and practice, whereby the inferior Clergy are subjected to the Superior; and a part unto the whole Body; (i.e. one, or a few parts, to the many parts; or to all the rest of the Body); and by this also is our obedience directed,

§. 47. n. 30.
2.

See before,
§. 45. n. 3.

1 Cor. 14.
33.

rected, whenever an inferior, and a Superior; a part, & the whole, differ: Nor can any justly raise a dispute, in this divided Body, whom they should obey, when they see both the *Number*, and *Primacy*, are unequal. See for these things what is said before, *Prop. 12. §. 23.*—And 1. *Disc. §. 21. n. 2.*—Therefore: In a division between any single Guide, and that Corporation of them whereof he is a member, this body justly claims the obedience both of that Guide and of all those subjected to him. As the decree of the whole in the *Acts* || was to be obeyed by the *Antiochians*, before the orders of one, or a few members of it, that were zealous of the law, though these members should have bin the proper *Pastors*, and *Guides* of the Church of *Antioch*, because of the subordination of these Pastors to the other supreme Representative of the Church. And again; In any great division hapning in this *Body* it self, our obedience follows the fuller Body of them still; which, in respect of the rest being fewer, bears the name of the *whole*; Especially, when the *supremest Ecclesiastical Governor* that is upon earth, the chief President of this Body, joyns with it, (upon which terms only, obedience to these Guides is demanded from those of the *Reformation*). Thus it is, before that any be excluded, by heresie, from this Body: But when any, in its former lawful Councils, are so cut off, then our obedience follows the fuller Body of them; these other, how numerous soever afterward, excepted.

§. 48.

Now this fuller Body at this day, joined with the chief Pastor of Christs Sheep here on earth, if any one seeketh after for his safe conduct to future happiness, he cannot but discern it from all other Christian *Societies*, that pretend to guide him. And, this found; again, he, using the ordinary care of persons desiring instruction, cannot but come to know its *Councils*, and their *definitions*, its doctrines, and Laws, (which, we find, as the Leaders of all Sects do theirs, so those of the Church Catholick are studious to divulge, and publish); cannot but come to know them, I say, so far as, they are by him, considering his condition, necessary to be known, and so far as the profession, or practice, thereof, is required of him.

For Example: In the Church of *England*, who is there, using the ordinary care necessary in matters of his salvation, that first cannot easily discern this *Church*, from the several other later, and unheaded, *sects*, that are in this Kingdom? and, this Church known, who may not easily attain, therein, to a knowledge also of its *Articles of Religion*, and *Canons*, its *Synods*, or *Convocations*, delivered by the common Tradition, and by the Church-Guides,

Guides and publick Writings daily inculcated, so far as the understanding of them is to him necessary.

The same evidence therefore in these things must be allowed not to be wanting to those, who have once found, among the many Societies of Christians, that Church, which is their right Guide.

Little reason then, have the Reformed to affirm a necessity, that all Necessaries should be made most evident, even to the unlearned, in the Scriptures, if such thing asserted by them only on this account, because such people have no means of attaining any certain knowledge of such necessities from the *Ministry* of the Church. And with little reason seem Dr. Stillingfleet, and others, to affirm (which yet is used by many late Protestant-Writers, as a main ground of evacuating the authority of the Church) * that it is no easier a thing to know, what the Church defines, than what Scripture determines; and, *That the same Arts, that can evade the Texts of Scripture, will equally elude the Definitions of Councils* ||; || Tillotson, [as if all Writings were equally plain, or equally obscure; or, Rule of if none free from, therefore all equally liable to, cavils]; And faith, p. 21. again to affirm, * *That the Argument of the willingness of all Protestants to submit their judgments to Scripture, will hold as well (or better) for their unity; as that of the readiness of all those of the Church of Rome to submit their judgments to the sense, and determination of the Church, will hold for their unity.*

And this, when this Unity of Protestants is to be effected by the Scriptures, as to those matters, wherein the sense of the same Scriptures is controverted amongst Christians; for in such points only it is, that other Christians, for their unity, seek to the decisions of the Church. [As if they undertook to defend this: That a living Judge, set up for the expounding of the dubious places of the Law, to the sentence of which Judge all are agreed to assent, yet is no more effective for ending controversies about the sense of the Laws, and for uniting parties; than the Laws themselves are without such Judge.]

Dr. Stillingfleet's words are ||, — *Your great Argument for the unity of your party; because, whatever the private opinions of men are, they are ready to submit their judgments to the censure and determination of the Church; if it be good, will hold as well (or better) for our unity, as yours, because all men are willing to submit their judgments to Scripture, which is agreed on all sides to be infallible.* || p. 106.

If you say, that it cannot be known, what Scripture determines, but it may be easily what the Church defines. It is easily answered, that the *e-veum* shews it to be far otherwise; for how many disputes are there concerning the power of determining matters of faith, &c? [concluding thus,] so that upon the whole it appears, setting aside force, and fraud,

fraud, (which are excellent principles of Christian unity) we are upon as fair terms of union, as you are among your selves. Where, doth he not say this in effect, that the true Church being known, and its authority also being granted infallible (as that of the Roman Church is by its subjects), Yet, we can no more know, what this Church defines (suppose what the Church of Rome, or of England, defines concerning *Transubstantiation, St-Invocation, Sacrifice of the Mass, &c.*) than what Scripture determines concerning these points; and that *Canons, Catechisms, &c.* authorized by a Church, can no further clear any point to us than Scripture did formerly; and that only the Church is so unfortunate, in her publick interpretations of Scriptures, that her Expositions are no plainer, than the Text; and that only force, or fraud unites her subjects in their opinions? And, if so; what fault hath the Council of Trent made, in its new definitions, if, after these Definitions, it seems, || there is as much division, (and then liberty also), of opinions, as was before them? Why do they accuse its decrees, as plain enough, but erroneous; and not invalidate them rather, as dubious, and uncertain? Why dispute they not, whether these, we have now extant, be its genuine Acts? Would it not be advantageous to the Reformed, to shew, that this Council makes nothing against them? In such unreasonable Contests, hath Mr. *Chillingworth*, by inventing many captious questions and evasions to weaken Church-authority, engaged his followers. As if, though Catholicks allow, several things in Councils to be obscurely delivered; some proceedings in some things unjust; the legality of some Councils disputed, &c, yet there could not remain still enough clear and unquestionable both of Councils, and their Canons, both * to establish the most illiterate subjects of the Catholick Church in all such, as is thought necessary, faith, (whose obligation is not to believe all things defined, but all things sufficiently proposed to them to be so); and * to overthrow the past Reformation.

J. Stillingfl.
p. 102.



THE THIRD DISCOURSE.

CHAP. I.

*Concerning an Ecclesiastical Guide, things generally agreed
on by the two Churches.*

Roman-Catholics and Protestants agreed.

1. That the Scriptures are God's Word, §. 1.
2. That in these Scriptures (agreed on) it is clearly declared, that the Church, in no age, shall err in Necessaries, §. 2.
3. That the Church-Catholick is contra-distinct to Heretical, and Schismatical Churches, §. 4.
4. That Christ hath left in this Church Pastors and Teachers, to keep it from being tossed to and fro, and carried about, with every wind of Doctrine, §. 5.

157. **B**OTH Roman-Catholics, and Protestants are agreed; That there is sufficient certainty, in the General Tradition of the Catholick Church descending to the present Age, that the Bible, or Holy Scriptures, are the Word of God.

§. 1.

2ly, They are agreed. That it is clearly declared in these Scriptures, that the Catholick Church, in no age, shall err in *Ordends, or Practices, necessary for obtaining Salvation.*

§. 2.

From which Christians seem to be secured; That, in their approving, and conforming to what is granted generally to be held by the Church-Catholick, (of any age whatsoever), they shall incur no Error, or Practice, destructive of Salvation. Whereas a hazard herein may be, in their departing from the Doctrine, or Practice, of the Church-Catholick, or of all the particular

§. 3.

ticular Churches, of any age; all, or some of which must be the Catholick.

§. 4.

Hooker 1. 3. c. ult. p. 124. —
Field 1. 1. c. 10. p. 14, 15. — Dr.
Fenn. Divis.
Eng. R. m. §. 10. — Archbith.
Lawd p. 140.

3ly, Learned Protestants consent with Roman Catholics, That, the Holy Catholick Church (which we believe in our Creed) is a visible Church in all ages, consisting of Pastors as well as People, in external Profession, and Communion contra-distinct to Heretical, and Schismatical Churches, when such there happen (as be in any age) See before, Disc. 2. §. 5. — Disc. 1. §. 44. and below, §. 19. n. 2. Casaubons. Letter to Perron.

§. 5.

Rph. 4. 11, 14

4ly, They are also agreed: That Christ hath left in this Church-Catholick these Pastors, and Teachers to the end of the world, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ; that we may not be tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, by the sleight of men. Thus far they agree.

CHAP. II.

The further Assertions of Catholics, concerning the Infalibility of the Church-Guides, the extent thereof, and subjection of Particular Persons, or Churches, to them.

Roman Catholics further affirming,

1. The Church-Guides, at least assembled in Lawful General Councils, shall never err in their determining Points of necessary Faith;
2. Points necessary for the salvation of souls, as when absolutely required, but all were not held to be necessary;
3. Shall never err in them; nor as infallibly inspired to teach any new, but as divinely assisted in determining of the former, Revelations and Traditions;
4. That, forasmuch as many of former Councils have been lawfully General, or Obliging, a Christian may safely rely on the most general judgment of the Church, since the sitting of such Councils;
5. That, in the absence of a considerable part of the Church-Government, as in a General Council, yet when assembled up its decrees, or commands within Doctrine are really an equivalent to a Council General.

10. That,

10. That, particular, Persons, or Churches, Parts of the whole, are obliged to submit their judgments to the Decrees, and Definitions of the whole, §. 14.

But, here, the two Parties divide, in their Supererogations :

For 51y, The Catholics go on, and affirm further ; That these Pastors, and Governors of the Church, at least when assembled in a Lawful General Council (or in so General, as the present times of the Church, according to the several Requisites of such great meetings, do well admit), universally accepted, (I mean in the sense before explained, Disc. 1. §. 21. n. 12. 28. 38. And below §. 131.) shall never err in their Determinations, or teaching of *Credends*, and Practicals necessary for obtaining salvation : and therefore that Christians, in their assenting to such Determinations, remain secure from all such Errors.

First, the Reason, why the Teachers are affirmed, thus, unerrable, is Because most of those places in Scripture, from which is gathered the Church's Indefeasibility, or inerrability, in Necessaries (Prop. 2.) [as Mat. 16. 18. — 17. — comp. 20. — 28. 20. — John 14. 16. — 1 Tim. 3. 15. — Luke 10. 16. — Eph. 4. 11, 14.] do appear to relate, more especially to these Guides thereof, than to the Common people. And, Because, this seems no more than necessary, Since God hath required nothing to be externally professed by us as Truth, or acted by us, in obedience to Command, but what our Judgement, or Conscience first internally assents to, as Truth, and as Lawful ; It seems (I say) no more than necessary, that, in the many doubts which may arise, especially to the more ignorant sort, both in *Credends* and *Practicals*, there be some sure and unfailing Directors of these our interior Judgments herein, as to all Necessaries : which Director, in such doubts, can neither be the Scripture, the sense of which is ambiguous unto us, and the thing wherein we seek direction, nor yet the Civil Magistrate, in these spiritual Matters, but only the Ecclesiastical : to whose Guidance of Souls also, we are committed, and enjoined Obedience. Heb. 13. 17. 7. (See, before, §. 3. — And Disc. 2. §. 14. *Chillingw.*)

2. Next, The Reason, why these Guides are affirmed unerring, at least, when joyned in a General Council is, because

1st. It cannot reasonably be questioned, but that, what authority every one of them singly hath from our Lord, the same all of them retain in this Body united, without the need of

§. 7.

§. 8.

any new Commission from the Church-Catholick, 21y.
Because, if there be any Promise, made to them in any capacity
of indeficiency in Necessaries; then, of all manners or ways de-
viceable wherein they may be so, it is in this *Conjuncture* of them,
and that the most universal that can be procured (used in all ages,
as the *Supreme Court of Appeals*), that they appear to be most
capable thereof, and least liable to defect ||.

|| See Mat. 18.

17, 20. - 1 Cor.

5. 4, 15. See

below §. 94.

† Act. 15. 2, 6.

Catholicks are also * confirmed, by the *Apostolick* practice in
the *Acts* †, where, for solving a great difficulty, they called an
Assembly of the Church-Governors; and passed some *Decrees*
therein, to which all particular Churches, and their Pastors stood
obliged: Seeming (there) to fortifie their Authority with these
two Expressions, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto, & nobis* (v. 28.)
And — *Nobis, & Spiritui Sancto, quod supradicta collecta in unum*. v. 25. As
also the Holy Ghost descended on them at first (*Acts* 2. 1.) when
so assembled. To which *Assembly* also the great *Apostle* St. Paul,
notwithstanding that his Doctrine was immediately revealed to
him by our Lord Jesus, and confirmed to others by his Miracles,
yet was sent by God's immediate appointment; (for he saith, he
went to this *Council* by *Revelation*, Gal. 2. 2.) that so his Doctrine
might both be the more authorized to his Auditors; and his Con-
verts more readily obey it, (and so he not run in vain, nor lose
his labour,) when they knew it to be confirmed, and established
by this *General Council*.

[With which, thus, Theodor-
begins his Epistle to Leo. — *Si Paulus pro Veritate, Tabernaculi
sanctissimi Spiritus ad magnam Petrum occurrit; ut is, qui Antiochia
de Institutis Legalibus contendebant, ab ipso afferret solutionem;
multo magis nos, qui abjecti sumus, & Pusilli, ad Apostolicam se-
dem vestram eurrimus, ut Ecclesiarum ulceribus Medicinam, a vobis
accipiamus.* — And St. Austin || — *Ipse Apostolus Paulus, post
ascensionem Domini, de Celo vocatus, si non inveniret in carne
Apostolos, quibus communicando, & cum quibus conferendo Evangelium,
eiusdem Societatis esse appareret, Ecclesia illi omnino non crederet. Sed
cum cognovisset, eum hos annunciantem, quod etiam illi annunciabant,
& in eorum communionem, &que unitate viventem, &c., meruit
queritatem, &c.* below And again, * confirmed by the *Primitive*
Practice, afterward, in the first *General Councils* universally
allowed; who required *Assent* under *Anathema* to their *Defini-*
tions; and inserted them, as it was thought meet, into the *Credo*;
which sufficiently declares, that they held themselves *infallible*, or

|| Contra Fau-
stum 1. 28. c. 4.

(which is all that is here meant by it) actually erring, there-
fore, when any Division happens in this Collective
Body, it being certain, that some *Clergy* for ever must be so in-
fallible

fallible (the Church-Catholic being ever so; and never consisting of People only, without Pastors); It is necessarily devolved also upon the much major, and more dignified, part of this united Body of the Clergy to be so: Because else, the Catholic Church would not be *One* in its Constitution; but a Body divided in it self, and so, which could not stand, if two several Parties in such Council, without any just *subordination* to one another, might both pretend themselves to be the *inerring Guide*.

6ly. For these Church-Guides being affirmed *inerrable* in *Necessaries*; Catholics here do understand *Necessaries*, not in so strict a sense, as to be restrained, and limited only to those few points of Faith, that are so manifestly required to be of all explicitly believed, as that *salvation* is not possibly consistible with the disbelief, or ignorance, of any of them: But affirm, they ought to be understood in a sense more enlarged; comprehending at least, all such points as are very requisite, and beneficial to *salvation*, either in respect of Christian Faith, or Manners; either for the direction of particulars, or Government of the whole Society of Christians. (Of which see what is spoken more largely in the 2d. Disc. §. 9.)

§. 9.

7ly. Concerning the particular *Manner*, or *Messure*, of these Church-Governors, when assembled in a lawful General Council, their being affirmed *inerrable*, or *infallible*,

§. 10.

1st. As Catholics do not hereby understand them at all, but entirely *unerrable* in any matter whatever, which they may attempt to determine; but only in such matters as appear to them of necessary Faith, taken in the sense before-mentioned; So neither do they hold touching these necessary points, any inherent habitual infallibility, residing either in the whole Council, or some Members thereof; whereby they perceive, and know themselves infallibly inspired, as to such points; after the same manner, as the Apostles, or Prophets did; but only an actual non-erring in those things which they define; from the promised Divine assistance, and super-intendent Providence constantly directing their Consultations into the Truth, (by what several ways, or means, it was not to know); or also from the clear Evidence of former Revelation, and Tradition of the same defined from which Evidence Protestants also grant, that there may be certain for some divine Teachers, who are not infallible in all.

§. 9. & Disc. 2. §. 9.

2ly. Catholics affirm, These Guides, in all ages, since that of the Apostles, equally infallible; and that the present Church doth not, as may not, pretend to any infallibility; or exercise any authority consequent thereof; which the ancient Catholic Church did

Chillingworth p. 140. 118 166.
- See Disc. 4. §. 10.

not:

not claim, and also practise, in the same sort. In other, General Councils, as yet, at this ancient Church also required. Aflene under Anathema to its Definitions, and inserted some of them into the Creed, and some of these also points of great difficulty, and subtle distinctions that so may the present, or the future Church do the like.

§. 11.

By the Councils of the several Churches that have been assembled, in former ages, to know which, or how many, of them have been lawfully general; or in their obligation equivalent thereto, any Christian (without going about to satisfy himself in all those curious Questions, moved by Protestants; several of which are considered below, §. 126. &c.) may securely rely on the acceptance, and acknowledgement, or non-appeal, of them, under their Decrees, by the Church-Catholic, at that age, wherein they were held, and of the ages following; i. e. by the Teachers, and Writers therein unanimously maintaining, or not gaining, the Doctrines of such Councils; and, by the Church's practice, conforming to their Instructions. Or, where some persons, or Churches dissent from the rest; by the Major part of those Churches accepting them, when they are united also with St. Peter's Successor; (the always Prime Patriarch, and Supreme Bishop of the Christian world), the Bishop of Rome.

As, for Example; Catholics hold; that a Christian may securely embrace, and obey the Decrees of those Councils as General: or, in their obligation, equivalent thereto, the Decrees whereof were accepted by the whole Church-Catholic (tacitly at least, in their Liturgies, Writings, Practices, being conformable thereto, or not dissenting therefrom,) at the Appearance of Luther, and are accepted still, both by the much major part of the Christian world; and also ratified by the Supreme Pastor of the Church-Catholic.

§. 12.

The Reason of this. Because, if a Christian may not securely rely on such an Acceptation, a few persons, or Churches, resisting, or standing out (perhaps those who are condemned also of Heresy, and Schism, by such Councils); This will void the obligation of all Councils whatever. And, upon the same terms the Arian Bishops, and their Churches, that dissented, will void the Obligation of the first General Council of Nice; and those dissenting Persons, and Churches of the Nestorian, and Eutychians, or Dioscorians, (some of which continue in the Eastern, or Southern parts of the world unto this day) will void that of the third, and fourth General Councils of Ephesus, and Chalcedon. (See more of this, Diss. 2. §. 25. &c.)

Be-

* Because, considering the nature of a multitude, such thing can hardly be, but that some will dissent from the rest; and therefore it seems as necessary to proceed according to the same Rule in the Church Catholick's accepting the Council's Decrees; as in the Council's *making* them, [viz. that the Vote of the *much* major part conclude the *whole*,] to render the actions of such great *Bodies* valid.

§. 13. Concerning the Acceptation of Councils by the whole; or major part of the Church Catholick, this seems reasonable; That, though the representatives of some considerable part of the Church Catholick should be wanting in some of these Councils, (especially when they are assembled for deciding some Controversies arising only in that part of Christianity, where the Council sits), yet the certain concurrence of that absent part of the Church Catholick in their doctrines, with the decrees of such Councils, should pass for a sufficient acceptation of them; and such absence no way prejudice the obligation of such Decrees. For it may well be presumed, the members of such Churches, if present, would have voted in the Council, what they hold, out of it, hold, before it, contradict, not, after it.

§. 13.

§. 14. Catholicks do hold, all particular persons, and Churches, taken dividim, as being only a part of, and subordinate to, the whole; (as also all particular Bishops are only single members of the whole Body of them, assembled in a Council), so stand obliged in submission of their judgement, and in obedience of assent, to the Definitions and Decrees of the whole, in these Supreme Courts thereof, wherein it can give its judgement, viz. its lawful General Councils; when these are accepted also by the Church Governors absent, in the manner formentioned.

§. 14.

See Disc.

§. 23.

The Reason, Because these Supreme Courts are secured for ever by our Lords Promise, that they shall not err, or misguide the Church's subjects in Necessaries, (§. 6. 7.) I mean Necessaries taken in the sense above explained, Disc. §. 9. And next: because, what, or how much, is to be accounted, thus, necessary, the judgement of this belongs also to these Church Governors, not their subjects, as is shewed before 2. Disc. §. 8. 2.

§. 15.

CHAP. III.

2. Concerning Heresy and Schism, in any departure from these Guides.

Roman Catholics proceeding to affirm.

11. That all persons dissenting from, and opposing, any known Definition of the Church, in a matter of Faith, are Hereticks.

12. All persons separating, on what pretence soever, from the external Communion of the Church-Catholick, Schismatics, §. 2.

But yet: that Difference of Opinions or Practices between co-ordinate Churches, may be without Heresy or Schism on any side, where no obligation to these lying on both, from their common Superiors, or from the whole. §. 23.

§. 16.

13. Touching the two great Crimes of Heresy and Schism, dividing such persons, or Churches, as are guilty thereof, from the Catholick Church, and Communion (See before Prop. 3. §. 4.)

1st, For Heresy: the Catholicks affirm, That any particular Person, or Church, that maintains, or holds the contrary to any to him made-known Definition (passed in a matter of faith,) of any lawful General Council; (1. e. of those Councils, that are accepted by the Church-Catholick in the sense, mentioned before ||, as such), is Heretical: [Not meddling here, whether some others also, besides these, for opposing some Doctrines clearly contained in Scripture, or generally received by the Church, and such as are by all explicitly to be believed, may be called so.] 2. They affirm, That those may become Hereticks in holding an error in the faith after the Church's Definition of such a Point, who were not so, before.

|| See §. 12.

§. 17.

Where, The Reason, why the certain judgment of Heresy is made not from the testimony of Scripture, but of the Church; and why all holding of the contrary to such definition known is pronounced Heresy, though sometimes the same error, before it, was not so, is, because no Error in Faith can be judged Heresy, but where there appears some Obstinacy, and Contumacy joyned thereto. Neither can such Obstinacy, and Contumacy appear, especially as to some Points of Faith, from the Scriptures; because the sense of Scripture, as to some matter of Faith, may be,

be, as to some persons, *ambiguous*; and not clear. But the sense of the Church, (or her General Councils), which is appointed by God the Supreme Expofitor, and Interpreter of the sense of the Scriptures, that are any way doubtful, and disputed, is so clear, as that any rational or disinterested person, to whom it, and the authority delivering it, and the divine assistance of that authority, are proposed, according to the evidence producible for them, can neither deny her just authority over him; nor her veracity, and her Exposition of Scripture clearly against him: who yet cannot see, or at least hath not the same cogent evidence to acknowledge, the Scripture, in such point, to be so: and so, such person will thenceforth become in this sense *deceiv'd* & self-convinced: and, if others happen, by their contracted fault, not to be so, their guilt, in general at least, is not lessened, but aggravated thereby.

Therefore the Apostle writes to Tit. 3. 10. Bishop, *Titus*: that, after a second Admonition, he should reject a man *Heretical*, or still adhering to his own Opinion, knowing that such a one sinneth, being self-condemned, [viz.] that he disobeyeth the doctrine of the Church, concerning which Church he either hath, or might have, sufficient evidence, that he ought to believe Her: And our Lord commands, that he, who, in matters controverted, refuseth to hear the Church, should be withdrawn from by the Christian, as a Heathen, or Publican was by the Jew. Thus, it seems by these Texts, is *Herese* known, and Hereticks to be rejected.

And the Fathers also are frequent in declaring those to be *Hereticks*, who, after the Church's Definition, continue to retain an opinion contrary thereto; whereas, themselves or others, in holding the same Opinion before such Definition, were not so.

Thus S. Austin ||— *Qui in Ecclesia Christi morbidum aliquid, prae-* De Civ. Dei
unumque sapiunt, si, correpti [(i) by the Church], *ut sanum re-* 1. 18. c. 51,

et unumque sapiant, resistunt contumaciter, suaque mortifera, & pestifera dogmata emendare nolunt, sed defendere persistunt, haeretici fiunt. [It seems, one holding dogma pestiferum & mortiferum before the Churches correction, may be no Heretick; who, yet, is so after it].

And elsewhere of the *Donatists* he saith ||— *Post causam cum eo* [Cæciliano] *dictam at qua finitam, falsitatis rei de-* De Hæresi-
prehensi, pertinaci dissensione firmata, in hæresim, schisma, verto- bus,
runt; tanquam Ecclesia Christi, propter crimina Cæciliani de-

sototerrarum orbe perieris— Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos, ubi se amplius Hæreticos esse firmarunt; cum Ecclesia Catholica universa plagaris, non in ipsa hæresis baptismi communis rescindere. [Where observe, that they are charged by this Father for *Herese*

|| c. 11.

|| De Hæresi-
bus,

|| Epist. 118.

(which *Henricus* of theirs. Protestants would fain divert to other matters) in the point of *rehabilitation*; and that, because this point now settled by the Church. And so *Mineur. Lævins*. || — *Quædam miræ conuersio. Aduersus ejusdem opinionis Catholicos; con-
fessio mortis, vera hæretici, judicantur; absolvuntur; magistri, condem-
nantur discipuli, &c.* [the wonder here is, that, in holding the self-same opinion, the one are not *Hereticks*, the other are; i. e. after a General Council had condemned the Tenent.]. Again *St. Austin* || gives *Quid-amb. Dnm*, for avoiding Heresies, this General Rule. — *Scire, sufficit, Ecclesiam contra aliquid sentire, ut illud non recipiamus in fidem.* [It seems this was a Principle with the Father. — *Nihil recipiendum in fidem, or, credendum, contra quod sentit Ecclesia.* And we know, what follows, i. e. *Credendum, esse, quod sentit.* Where the contraries are immediate, and *subdure una, patiuntur alterum.* But this latter also is expressly said by him || — *Si quid horum per orbem frequenter Ecclesia; hoc, quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insensitissima insania est.* This, concerning doing; and then it holds also for believing; the Church's Faith being (i. e. either.) more sure, and free from mistakes than her practice. But, for believing too, he saith || — *Respon. ut hoc credamus, quod universa Ecclesia, a Sacrilegio schismatis remota, custodit.* — And — *Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Concilio institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate Apostolica traditum, vestissime creditur.* But what if a thing be *Concilio institutum*, of things thus defined he saith, || *Quid in hoc sentiendum est, plenius Concilii sententia totius Ecclesia consensus confirmat.* Therefore, after the Churches definition, he saith, One, in holding the contrary, then first becomes an *Heretick*, when he knows, or by his fault is ignorant, that the Church hath defined it; See *de Baptismo. contra Dnan. l. 4. c. 16.* — *Constituimus erga (saith he) duos aliquos isto modo, unum eorum, verbi gratia ad sentire de Christo, quod Phœsius opinatus est [i. e. in modern language, to be a Socinian, no small error] & in eju. heresi baptizari contra Ecclesia Catholicæ Communionem; alium vero hoc idem sentire, sed in Catholica baptizari, existimantem ipsam esse Catholicam fidem; illum non debem Hereticum dico, nisi, manifestata sibi doctrina Catholica fidei, resistere maluerit. & illud, quod tenetur, elegit, &c.* Suitable to this notion of *Heretick* in *S. Austin* sense is that of the second General Council in *Can. 6.* who there, disenableing any *Hereticks* from accusing orthodox Bishops in any Ecclesiastical matters explain, themselves thus whom they mean, by *Hereticks*, involving *Schismatics* also within the same name, as then was commonly said. — *Heretici nunc dicimus, &*

qui

qui olim ab Ecclesia abdicati sunt, & qui sunt postea a nobis unius-
matritati: ad hoc autem & eas, qui se sanam quidem sententiam voluerunt
pro se ferre, avulsi autem sunt & abscissi, & universis Christianis
nostros Episcopos congregationem faciant.

And this is Dr. Hammonds Comment on the foregoing
place of *Timm* (how consonant to, his own, or other Protestant's
doctrines, I know not) — *Autzardent* || self-condemned, sig-
nifies not a man's publick accusing, or condemning his own doctrines or
practices; for that self-condemnation, being an effect, and part of re-
pentance, would rather be a motive to free any from the censures of the
Church, who were already under them, than aggravate their crime,
or bring that punishment upon them; Nor yet altho' can it denote
him that offends, and yet still continues to offend against conscience;
and, though he be in the wrong, yet holds out in opposition to the
Church. For (besides, that there are very few, that do so, and these
known to none but God; and, if that were the Character of an Heret-
tick, then none but Hypocrites would be Hereticks; and he, that,
through pride, and opinion of his own judgement, stood out against the
d.ctrine of Christ, and his Church in the present times, should not be an
Heretick) this inconvenience would further be intred, that no He-
retick could possibly be admonished, or censured by the Church; for no
man would acknowledge of himself, that what he did was by him done
against his own conscience; nor could any testimony be produced a-
gainst him before any humane Tribunal; no man being able to search
the heart. It is rather an expression of his separation from, and dis-
obedience to, the Church; and so an evidence of the *Heretick*
aquatam being perverted, and sinning wilfully, and without cause.
For he that thus disobeys, and breaks off from the unity of the Church,
doth in effect inflict that punishment on himself, which the Church
inflicts on Malefactors, that is, *excommunication* 2 Cor. 13. 10 and *excommunication*
cutting off from the Church; which when he being an Heretick (and
therein a *Schismatic* also) doth voluntarily, without the Judges sen-
tence, his very dispute is a spontaneous *excommunication*, or excommunication.

And, that this Doctor may not go alone, see Dr. *Ferns* §. 19. n. 2.
Comment on the same place || when he writ against Presbyterianism, || The Case be-
accusing them of Schism from the Church of England. The || tween the Ch.
word Heretick (saith he), according to the use of it, im- || of England
plies one, that obstinately stood out against the Church, or that led any Sect || and Rome n. 53
After the strictest Sect (or Heresie) of the Pharisees, (Acts 26.
9.) After And, which they call Heresie, Acts 24. 14. a faction
Company divided from the Church, so they called, or accounted
Christianity, and (Gal. 5. 20.) we have it reckoned among
works of the flesh; (Debauch, Contentions, Heresie, & here, He-
retick

retick, that leads a faction, a sect, or that wilfully follows, or abets it. A man therefore, that is a Heretick, contentious, disobedient to the Order and authority of the Church; reject, for he is self-condemned; having both past the sentence upon himself, by professing against, or dividing from, the Church: and also done execution, (like that of the Church's censure, and excommunication) upon himself by actual separation, or going out of the Church. A fearful condition. Thus he.

|| Of Fundamentals c. 9. §. 4.

And something to the same purpose saith Dr. Hammond, || concerning the guilt of those, who afterward deny, or oppose, the things defined, and added to the Apostles Creed, by the first Councils. — Though the Creed (saith he) in the ancient Apostolick form, were sufficient for any man to believe and profess; yet, when the Church hath thought meet to erect that additional Bulwark against Hereticks; the rejecting, or denying the truth of those their additions, may justly be deemed an interpretative siding with those ancient, or a desire to introduce some new, Heresies. — And the pride, or singularity, or heretical design of opposing or questioning them, now they are framed, being irreconcilable with Christian charity, and humility, is justly deemed criminal, and liable to censures. — Again, §. 6. Though those, who believed, &c. [the matter of the Apostles Creed] had all those Branches of Christian Faith which were required to qualify mankind to submit to Christs Reformation, yet (he grants) the wilful opposing these more explicit Articles [added by Councils] and the resisting of them, when they are competently proposed from the Definition of the Church, will bring danger of ruine on such persons. — Again §. 8. — This [(i) of one Baptism] and all the former additions [in the Nicene Creed] being thus sealed by the universal Church were, and still are in all reason, without disputing, to be received, and embraced by the present Church, and every meek member thereof. — [Here then it seems that Heresie it is, or something criminal, equivalent thereto, to oppose, or deny the truth of, the Church's definitions, and additions, though the former Creed was sufficient to have been believed, and professed in all times before them.] And note here, that whatever the Doctor saith of the disobeying or denying the truth of the Definitions of these first four General Councils, must be said of any other following lawfull General Councils held in any Age whatsoever, all these having the same and equall authority. Lastly, King James, in his Answer to Card. Perron penned by Casaubon, seems to have the same Notion of Heresie, as also of Schism, with the Roman Church, and the Fathers, making Heresie any departing from the Faith, Schism, from the Communion, of the Church Catholick. — Credit vero Rex (saith Casaubon) || Imperator, sine

|| Letter to Peron,

fuca

& fallacii, unicam esse Ecclesiam Dei, & re, nomine, Catholicam, sive Universalem; toto diffusam mundo: extra quam ipse quoque nullam Salutem debere sperari affirmat: damnat & detestatur eos, qui vel jam olim, vel postea, aut a fide recesserunt Ecclesia Catholica, & facti sunt Hæretici; aut a Communione, & facti sunt Schismatici. [Difference here about the Extent of the Catholick Church there is some; but none, that all opposition of its Faith is Here-sie.] Again — Nullam spem Salutis superesse iis, qui a fide Ecclesia Catholica, aut ab ejusdem Communione discesserint; Rex ultero concedit. [I suppose, here is meant the present Catholick Church, and, in any difference, the main Body thereof: its whole and integral Faith, or any part thereof: and, its, external Communion. Otherwise if this meant of the Catholick Church collectively of all ages; when, in some ages, several points of Faith were not yet defined: and of every member thereof in those ages; when, in most points, may be found some dissenters: and of Points of Faith necessary (inferiors being Judges), a term applied, as any one pleaseth, to more points or fewer: Lastly of Communion internal; which may be said now to be deserted, now retained, as any diversly fancieth the true causes thereof; then, in all this said, nothing at all is said.]

12. * Again; for Schism; Catholicks affirm — That any particular, Person, or Church, which (for what cause soever, and particularly for this, the Church's requiring his assent, and conformity to the Definitions of such her Councils) doth actually relinquish, and separate from the external Communion of the present Church-Catholick, is Schismatical. [Meaning here, * by Catholick Church, the present true Superior Ecclesiastical Guides, and the Christian Congregations joyned with them, in the sense explained before. Disc. 2. Prop. 12. §. 23. And * by External Communion, the Church's Publick Prayers, and Worship of God, and the participation of her Sacraments. And * by actual relinquishing, and separating, either 'the setting up or joyning with, an Anti-communion; or, * a Voluntary absenting ones self from the Church's Communion; or at least 'the incurring of an Excommunication, or Separation, inflicted by the Church, for a non-conformity to her Decrees (of which see Dr. Hammond's Conclusion below, §. 22. n. 2.)]

§. 20.

The Reason; Because 'all separation from the external Communion of this Church, that is made out of a Non-conformity to any thing defined by these Superiors, is judged causeless; upon the

§. 21.

the former account, given §. 6. and §. 14. Since they can require no unjust condition of their Communion, (as, the assent, or subscription to an Error) that any Inferior can justly judge, or certainly know, to be so. And this; because in Necessaries these Church-Governors cannot mis-guide. (§. 6. 9.) And of what, or how-much is to be accounted necessary, the judgment also belongs to these Guides, not their Subjects. (see *Disc. 2. Prop. 6.*) Of whom also (divinely assisted) it is rationally presumed, that, to things judged no way necessary, they will never enjoin Assent upon the Church's Censures. But lastly, supposing, (not granting) that they should err in some non-necessary, to which notwithstanding they require Assent; yet cannot particular men have, in such matters, any sufficient ground of an infallible assurance of the contrary; which ground the Church cannot discover; and therefore cannot justly, on any such account, withdraw their submission. And for this reason also these Superiors, in whatever decrees they make, or impose, do never fall actually, or causally, into Heresie, or Schism; as being they who are not, from others, but all others, from them, directed to learn; in spiritual matters, what is true, and lawful; and to what they are, or are not, to conform. *But*, * Next; if any separation from this Church, should be made for a Doctrine, or Practise in it, to which an assent or a conformity is no way required by it; This will still be an *higher Schism*, because more void of any just pretence.

Epist. 48.

Of this matter thus *S. Austin* || (speaking not of the internal, but the external Communion of the Catholick Church; which, defining against Rebaptization, was upon this forsaken by the *Donatists*)—*Fieri non potest ut aliquis habeat justam causam, quæ communionem suam separet a communione ecclesiæ terranæ, &c.*

And (de unitate Ecclesiæ, c. 3.)—*Quicumque a Christi corpore, quod est Ecclesia, ita diffinitum, ut eorum Communio non sit cum totis, quæcumque diffunditur, sed in aliqua parte separata inveniantur, manifestum est eos non esse in Catholica Ecclesia.* [Cum tota, i. e. * with the Communion of that Body, which was totum integrum, before some separated from it; or after the separation, when now the former totum is divided, * with that part of the totum, from which the other part separates; which Body, that is parted from, is still the total Catholick Church, (of which total only *S. Austin* speaks); though the divided part, or parts (for the amplitude of this totum, is a casual thing, nor always the same) should in time swell to a greater magnitude, then it.]

Concerning this matter also, thus *Dr. Hammond* || in his Book of Schism, c. 12.—*For the universal, or truly Catholick Church*

Church of Christ; it is not, in S. Austin's Opinion, possible, that there should be any just cause for any to separate from it, nor consequently Apology to be made for those, that, on any, whether true, or pretended cause whatsoever, have readily incurred this guilt; and that it is not the Examination of the Occasion, or Cause, or Motive of any man's Schism; that is worth the producing, or breeding in this matter. The one thing that is of force, and moment, and by consequence pertains to be enquired into, is the truth of the matter of fact; whether this charge be sufficiently proved, or confessed; i.e. whether he that is thus accused, stands really guilty of Separation from the Church of Christ? Thus Dr. Hammond.

Where it would be ridiculous for any to say; that, by separation from the Church-Catholick, he means voluntary separation; and then, that by voluntary separation, he means a separation without any just cause, moving him to it; for this is only saying, there can never be just cause of a voluntary separation from the Church-Catholick without any just cause. Neither can the Doctor's meaning here be; that one indeed may not separate, but yet may by Excommunication be separated, for his non-conforming, in something, to the Church-Catholick, without Schism. For elsewhere, *¶* *Ans. to* he declareth, — *Continuance in* [I add, or incurring.] *Excom- Cath. Gen-* *munications to be actual Schism, supposing, that, if one will submit to* *theses. p. 90.* *that, which is lawful* [not that which he thinks lawful] *for him to submit to, he may be absolved, and freed from it.* Now the Church-Catholick, he holds here, can never require unjust conditions of her Communion, because upon such terms (he alloweth) a departure may be, without Schism. Here then, taking his words in their plain sense; since the Church-Catholick cannot justly be denied to be such a Church, as gives Laws, and requires certain Conditions of her external Communion; and since the Doctor affirms, *¶* that, where a Church requires unjust Conditions of her Communion, one may depart from, or continue out of, it, without Schism, it seems to follow, that the Doctor holds here; that *¶* *Of Schism,* *c. 2. §. 2. 3. §. 22.* the Church-Catholick can never require such unjust conditions (which how it consists with what is quoted out of him, *Disc. 1. §. 5.* I know not); and hence, that she did not require such at *Luther's* appearance. [Yet it is clear, that there was no Church then extant, (one, or more of which must be the Catholick), to the conditions of whose external Communion Protestants would submit; and from whose external Communion they departed not, See *Disc. 1. §. 8.* And then we see what follows, upon these Principles of Dr. Hammond's.]

§. 23.

Mean while the Catholicks grant, 1st. That, the several parts of this body may, without Schism, separate, or differ from one another in any doctrine, or practice, wherein they are obliged to no agreement or union from the Common Superiors of them both; and so long as one part divides not from the other in any thing, wherein the other agrees with the whole against it; in, which the whole enjyns both to the other, and it. But in such case, the division of this part is, as from the other part, so from the whole; and so becomes, for as division from the whole (and not from the other part), Schismatical. 2^{ly}. Then grant also; that one part may, lawfully, and without Schism, separate, or rather, absent it self from the external Communion of another, so often as either the Communion of the other part, suspected of Heresie or Schism, (before any evidence of the contrary,) is thought unlawful; or as this part requires some conditions of its external Communion, to which the other is not, by the whole, or by the Superiors of both, any way obliged. Thus the Catholicks.

CHAP. IV.

The Contrary Qualifications of Protestants, concerning the
 Infallibility of these Guides, and the obedience of
 their Subjects.

- On the other side, the Protestants, after the four first Propositions conceded, thus proceeding to qualifie them.
5. In their granting the Catholick Church unerrable in Necessaries, understanding thereby only such few Points, without which Salvation no way attainable. §. 24.
 6. Affirming the Church-Catholick, or all particular Churches, of some one age, or ages, errable in several other doctrines, dangerous to Salvation, gross, damnable, &c. §. 25. For that it appears, that many of the chief Points, from which Protestants dissent, were the General Tenents and Practices, at the coming of Luther, §. 26.
 7. Affirming, the Church's General Councils also, when these are universally accepted, to be unerring in Necessaries; but not so, in other, (and that is in the most), Points. And, on the former Extending universal acceptation to all particular Churches; and Restraining Necessaries, (as before) to those absolutely so. Again, Affirming the Councils not so accepted, to be errable also in Necessaries. §. 34, 35, 36.

9, 10. Allowing

- 9, 10. *Allowing Obedience also due to the definitions and decrees of such Councils: But not, that of Assent; but only of Non-contradiction.*
 §. 9. *(Where, of the Quality of the Obedience yielded by the Church of England to the four first Councils) §. 40.*
 11. *Obedience of Non contradiction: not generally, but where the Error of the Council not manifest, and intolerable. §. 43. Claiming also, where the Error manifest, a power, against such Council, to reform it, for themselves. §. 44.*
 12. *The judgment also (as for themselves,) when there is, or is not, such Error in Councils, left to particular Persons, or Churches, §. 47.*

But the Protestants, after conceding the four first Propositions, labour to pull down these superstructures of the Catholicks, which they see, else, would ruine their Communion and cause; and thus proceed. After the first four Propositions above, agreed on,

§. 24.

51y. They explain themselves, *That, by the Necessaries, wherein (Prop. 2.) they grant the Catholick-Church of all ages unerrable, they understand only those few Points (Spoken of before Disc. 2. Prop. 6.) without the explicit Belief of which Salvation is not at all attainable.*

For, in their saying, that she is so unerrable, they thus declare themselves.

That there alwayes shall be a number of men professing Christianity in the world; So Dr. Stillingfleet. || — *Stillingfleet, Rat. Accou. p. 251.*
A company of men that profess at least so much Truth as is absolutely necessary for their Salvation So Mr. Chillingworth || — That Christ do. h. and will so defend his Church, that there shall be for ever till the end of the world, a Church Christian on the earth; So Dr. Hammond || *Defence of L. Falkland, c. 1. §. 5, 6. p. 23.*
 No more inerrability in Faith, you see, here affirmed, than that, without which Salvation is absolutely, on what terms soever, in the Profession of Christianity, not attainable; wherein, they straiten Christs promises, as the Catholicks enlarge them, by which they gain the liberty of reforming, as they think fit, from the universal Church of God as to some ages, in most of her Doctrines; because they grant her not, save in some few necessities, unerrable, that may, as it were, still preserve life in Her, neither will they, concerning this Question, what are points necessary, (wherein our Lord hath promised an indefectibility to his Church,) what not, by any means stand to her judgement.

61y. They say: *That though the Church-Catholick is preserved always from error in absolute necessities, tak n in their*

§. 25.

their sense (§. 24.) (For otherwise, there would cease to be a Church of Christ upon earth); yet the same Church, or at least any, or all particular Churches of some age, or ages (some one, or many, or all which particular Churches must be the visible universal Church-Catholic of that age, or ages) may generally hold, and the Governors thereof impose upon their Subjects, such errors and corruptions, as are dangerous to Salvation; gross, damnable, &c. and therefore reformable by any particular Church for its self. [See what Archbishop-Bands §. 37. n. §. 6. — Mr. Stillingfleet, Rat Account Part 2. c. 2. p. 330. — and, c. 4. p. 370. 371. — and c. 8. p. 478 479. — Nath. Chillingworth, c. 5. §. 64. 49, 45, 27. — and the 31st Article of the Church of England; have said to this purpose.]

§. 26.

§. 27.

And the Reason of this Assertion seems to be: because these great points of modern controversy.

§. 28.

1. A Corporal Presence and a Transubstantiation, or substantial Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body.

§. 29.

2. Adoration, of the Eucharist, i. e. of Christs Body, and Blood, as present in it; which follows from the former.

§. 30.

3. The Sacrifice of the Mass; not only that of Prayers, Praise, and Thanksgivings; nor only of the Myteries, in the consecrating of them, offered as a Commemorative of the Passion (a thing conceded also by learned Protestants): but also of the very Body and Blood of Christ in these Myteries (which thing follows from the first Point) offered in this Service, *pro vivis*, & *Defunctis*, &c.

§. 31.

4. Invocation of the Blessed Virgin, and Saints.

And §. 5: Such Prayer for the dead, as infers their present condition before the day of Judgment; (whatever their restraint, or sufferings be); to be conceived betterable by the Intercessions of the Living.

Do appear to have been, universally, held, and practised; and the approbation, and conformity to them imposed by the Ecclesiastical Governors, both of the Greek and Latine Church, at the coming of Luther.

§. 32.

The clearing of which, because it is a consideration of great importance, and not meet to be omitted; nor can be here inserted without making too great a Parenthesis, and distracting your thoughts from the matter in hand; shall be further prosecuted in the 8th Chapter following. §. 82. &c. whither I refer you for it, if not in this matter already satisfied.

§. 33.

This then concerning the 4th Proposition: The Protestants affirming, that the Catholic Church of some age may incur, and

and maintain dangerous, gross, damnable, erroneous; and therefore inducing them thereunto.

7ly. They say. *1st.* It has, though the Catholick Church cannot err in absolute necessities; Yet the Governors, and Pastors thereof [Yet these are they, who are appointed by Christ to instruct, and guide the rest] are not so included in our Divine promise of the Church's Indefectibility, but that they, (i.e. the much major part of them) even when met in a General Council (if this not such as is accepted by the Church diffusive) may err in their Decrees; and that, even in Credends and Practicals that are fundamental, and necessary for obtaining Salvation; even those necessary absolutely (for such inerrability in absolutely necessities they allow only to the Church diffusive, not to her representative.) *2ly.* That, as the Church diffusive, so her General Councils, though these by the Church diffusive universally accepted may err in non-fundamentals, or non-necessaries; which non-necessaries, in themselves of || do extend to all points whatsoever, except those few, without a belief of which both the being of a Christian Church, and the obtaining of Salvation, absolutely faileth.

§. 34.

|| See before,
§. 24. — and
below, §. 52.

8ly. Hence they say: That so many of former Councils, as are acknowledged to be lawfully general, by the general consent of the Christian World; or, whose decrees, when published, are universally, i.e. by the whole Church Catholick, accepted, they will allow, for truly Oecumenical [or equivalent thereto.], So Dr. Stillingfleet: or [as the Arch-Bishop further] for infallible also; i.e. as to necessities; because the diffusive Catholick Church is held always in necessities infallible ||; and, That they will make the consent of the whole Christian World their judge, in such cases ||.

§. 35.

† p. 536.
|| p. 346.
† Abp. Lawd, p. 139. & 328.
— See §. 2.
|| Stillingfleet, p. 536. — Ap. Lawd, p. 193.

But then; here are two limitations (One of allowing those Councils infallible, or unerring, in necessities only; the other, if such Councils be universally accepted,) which (as they understand them) seem to discharge them of all obligation of assent to the decrees of any, though reputed never so lawful, or general a Council; I mean as to any grounding such assent upon its absolutely unerring, by virtue of our Lord's Promise.

§. 36.

1. For, from the first limitation, of the Council's unerring only in Necessaries: *1st.* they hold no assent, or submission of judgment, necessarily or absolutely due to a Council in such things wherein it is errable, as it is in all Non-necessaries. Next they say, that these Councils that are unerring in Necessaries,

ries, may not prescribe to them, what points are necessary, what not? (for so a Council might oblige their assent so far as it pleaseth) and from whom else they should learn Necessaries, I see not, unless from themselves. And so till these be well distinguished; they have no means to know, whether such Council is unerring in all those particulars which it defines, as all these being in some sense Necessaries. And thus still Protestants retain their liberty of dissenting from General Councils also generally accepted for any particular point whatever defined by them upon the uncertainty whether it is, or the seeming to them that it is not, a matter of necessary Faith. But, according to their *restraint* also of *Necessaries*, most conciliary definitions must be in Non-necessaries; wherein therefore these Councils are fallible; *fallible*, though *universally accepted*. But, if such Council not universally accepted, then fallible, they say, it may be also in Fundamentals.

§. 37.

See Disc. 2.
p. 110. &c.See Chilling.
c. 2. p. 139.
Stilling. p. 251

2ly. For the second limitation, requiring *the universal acceptation of such general Councils*; or, *the consent of the Church diffusive to their Decrees*; many of the reformed seem to exact this consent so far extended to all particular persons, or Churches, as that scarce any of those Councils general, even which they do allow, have had a reception so intire. || For, the reason; why a general Council universally accepted erreth not in Fundamentals, being this, Because the *whole Church*, or its *Clergy* diffusive, that accepts it, can never so err; and they maintaining, that in the Church diffusive, not the *much major* part of it; or of its Clergy, (I mean of those whose judgment can be procured) but only *some part* or *either* thereof, shall never so err, (which part how small, or inconsiderable, mean while it may be in number, or dignity, to the rest, they know not,) hence, any consent, or acceptation of the Church, or Clergy, less than *all*, or what is near it, renders them not secure of its not erring. Because here the promise of not erring may possibly be verified only in the small dissenting party. See Doctor Hammond of Heresie, p. 196 n. 6. where he saith, *That the promise of the Gates of Hell not prevailing against the Church, can no way belong to a Council*; all the *Members* of the Church were not represented in that Council; for if there be any left out, why (saith he) may not the promise be given to them, though the *Gates of Hell* should be opposed against the Council? || And what he saith of the Council, holds as much in the acceptation of it, where some refuse this, or sub. Therefore, none can give faith to the definition of the Fathers in the Council of Nicaea, suppose concerning Christ's Godhead upon our Lord's promise of the Gates of Hell

Hell not prevailing against his Church, if some few oppose it, (as the *Arians* did): for in them, not those of the Council, may the Promise be made good. And hence, whilst they finde in former ages a *Berengarius*, a *Wicliffe*, the *Waldenses*, an *Hu*, a *Luther*, and some Followers, varying from the judgment of the Councils called in their times, they are willing to believe, the Orthodox and *Catholick Faith*, to have been preserved in these few Dissenters and the Councils though universally accepted by the rest, to have erred from it; nor to oblige them upon the account of so general an approbation: and thus, even the dissent of those persons who have no power to vote in the Council, yet out of it, is effectual to void the obligation of the Council.

So, though they usually name the *Greek* and *Gallican*, as well as Protestant, Churches, as non-accepters of the Council of *Trent*; yet, if a sufficient acceptation thereof, as to *Protestant Controversies*, both of the *Gallican* and *Greek* Churches be proved to them, nothing is gained hence for securing its inerrability even in a Fundamental; because the belief of all necessities, and the verifizing of the Divine Promises, they hold, may be sufficiently conserved in the *Protestants* solely standing out against it. And, when they grant, that Councils universally accepted cannot err in necessities; they say only this, That some or other professing Christianity shall never so err; and then conclude from hence, that neither doth or can the whole so err in those things, wherein it agrees with them.

But next; admitting an infallibility in Necessaries to be allowed by the more sober and judicious Protestants to a Council accepted by a much major part of the Church-Catholick, though some persons, or Churches also, dissent, (without which nothing even in the first General Councils stands firm;) yet herein still is continued a contest, when the number of Dissenters is so great, and considerable, as to invalidate the ratification of the rest, when not: Nor see I, how it can be reasonably decided (yet a thing of greatest consequence) unless herein the minor will be content to follow the judgment of the much major part concerning what Councils stand thus admitted, or rejected; which rule were it observed, then both, in a valid acceptance of the Councils held in the Western Church in latter ages, Protestants will be cast; and by the determination of those Councils, several of their Disputes ended.

Mean while, upon these and other pretences so it is, that of 16. Councils, or thereabouts (reckoned up by the Cardinal ||) whose Decrees all the Western Churches (wherein several of these Councils, the most General that those times could afford, were called, for ending of some Controversies, that both arose in, and

De Concil.
l. 1. c. 5.

and troubled, only the West) of 16. Councils I say, which the Western Parts generally accepted, when *Luther* appeared, and which all the rest of the Western Churches, except these Reformers, continue still to approve, they allow none of them, that have handled any matters of Controversie wherein the present times are concerned, after the four first, or the 5th. and 6th, but then they cut off here the Canons made in *Trullo*. even those, wherein both East and West consented: and so, do allow none of any note that have been held in the Church for near this 1000 years; For indeed there is none of the *more famous* of them, and the acts whereof are *extant*, wherein something hath not been passed, that is contrary to the present Protestant Tenents||.

|| See Disc.
1. §. 75.

§. 38.

gly, To the Decrees of these General Councils also, when universally acknowledged such, (which yet, when so, they say may err in non-necessaries), they grant indeed an obedience due by all Inferiours, Persons, or Churches. And consequently, to those Decrees, in which they hold such Councils unerrable, i. e. in necessities, if all these necessities were certainly distinguishable from all other points that are not so, they must allow due an obedience of assent.

§. 30.
|| *Seilling. Kar.*
Account, p.
506.

But, 101y. They allow not (absolutely) This obedience of assent to their decrees||; but onely, where inferiours see just cause of dissenting, (as sometimes they say they may, since all these Councils are liable to error in non-fundamentals, which also, it is not known, how far they do extend), that of silence, and non-publick contradiction.

§. 40.
|| p. 375.

The Church of England indeed professeth her Assent to the Definitions of the first four General Councils; and Mr. *Seilling. Kar.* (I know not on what Protestant ground) saith, || *It is her duty to keep their Decrees, and be guided by the sense of Scripture as interpreted by them.* But you may observe: that this assent is not yielded to those Councils, because lawfully general; and so presumed to be assisted by our Lord in the right defining and delivery of all necessary Faith (for they say, lawful General Councils, not universally accepted in their sense, may err in Fundamentals; and those Councils, that are universally accepted, may err in Non-fundamentals); but because the matter defined by them (the Church of England being, for Her self, judge hereof) ought to be assented to, as being agreeable to the Scripture; and the Assent is not yielded for the Authority defining, as infallibly assisted in necessities, but for the appearing evidence in Scripture of the thing

thing defined; nor (at least) for the non-appearing evidence of the contrary; the Assent not yielded; because that particular persons, or Churches, are to take that for the true sense of Scripture, which these Councils may, possibly, give of it; but because those Councils gave, in their Definitions, that sense of Scripture, which such particular Persons, or Churches judge the true; so that the reason, which they give for their Assent to these General Councils, obligeth as much their Assent to them, had they been Provincial; And upon the same terms, as one person, or Church, assents to these Councils, because they judge their Decrees consonant to Gods Word, another, without withdrawing any due obedience, may dissent, who judgeth the contrary; and the authority, or decision, laies on Christians no ground of obligation, as to belief, save the reasonableness, or non-appearing unreasonableness of the Councils Doctrines: and submission of judgement is held not lawfully yielded by any, to whom the contrary seems evident: and by all others, is to be only conditional, viz. until the contrary shall appear evident.

¶ To this purpose, see the 21 Article of the Church of England — General Councils may err; wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to Salvation, have neither strength, nor authority, unless it may be declared, that they were taken out of holy Scripture.

§ 41. M. I.

See the Acts of Parliament, 1 Elizab. c. 1. wherein the determining, or adjudging any thing Heresie, by any Council, is thus limited; If, in such Council the same is declared Heresie by the express, and plain words of the Canonical Scriptures. The words are—Provided that such persons, &c. shall not have authority to determine any matters to be Heresie, but only such, as heretofore have been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be Heresie by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them; or by any other General Councils, wherein the same was declared Heresie by the Express, and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures.

And see (in Soave, p. 334, 366.) the exceptions taken by Protestants at the safe-conduct of the Council of Trent, for not adding to the authority of Councils and Fathers [fundamentis se veraciter in Scriptura], as it run formerly in the safe-conduct of Basil; That the Councils, Fathers, &c. conformable to the Scripture, should be Judges; by which means the Protestants reserved this retreat, when Councils appeared against them, that yet they were not obliged by them, because these Councils went also against the Scripture.

See Dr. Fern. Confid. p. 19. — To all the determinations of the Church we owe submission by assent, and belief;

belief conditional, with reservation for evidence out of Gods Word—and—In matters of Faith (saith he) we cannot submit to any company of men, by resignation of our judgement, and belief, or standing bound to receive for faith, and worship, all that they shall define, and impose for such; for such resignation gives to man what is due to God.

See Arch-Bishop Laud. p. 245.—General Councils lawfully called, &c. cannot err, keeping themselves to Gods Rule.—And p. 239.—In all truth necessary to Salvation (saith he) I shall easily grant a General Council cannot err [if] suffering it self to be led by the Spirit of Truth in the Scripture; and not taking upon it to lead both the Scripture, and the Spirit.

See Dr. Field, p. 666.—It is not necessary for us, expressly to believe whatsoever the Council hath concluded, though it be true: unless by some other means it appear unto us to be true, and we be convinced of it in some other sort, than by the bare determination of the Council only. But it sufficeth, that we be ready expressly to believe it, if it shall be made to appear unto us.

See Dr. Hammond, of Heresie p. 96. It is hence manifest also what is the ground of that reverence, that is by all sober Christians deemed due and paid, to the first four General Councils: Because, 1st. They set down and convinced the Truth of their Doctrine out of the Scripture. 2^{dy}. Because they were so near the Apostles times, when the sense of the Apostles might more easily be fetched from those Men and Churches, to whom they had committed it. [Thus he; though, besides that the first of these Councils was almost at 300. years distance; the reason of obedience to Church Governors, given by Doctor Hammond elsewhere || (viz. Because Christ speaks to us in those Governors as his mediate successors in the Prophetick, Pastoral, Episcopal office) infers, that the Church's authority in all ages is equally valid, and so voids this reason. He goes on.] 3^{dy}. Because the great Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity were the matter of their definitions, [yet he saith (See Disc. 1. §. 6.) that General Councils are no infallible Guide in Fundamentals; and ||—that it is the matter of the Decrees and the Apostolicallness of them, and the force of the justification, whereby they are approved, and acknowledged to be such, which gives the authority to the Council, and nothing else is sufficient, where that is not to be found.] Here also he gives no reason of our submission to these Councils or their Decrees upon this account; viz. the General acceptance of these by the Church-Catholick.

§. 41. n. 2.

See Mr. Chillingworth. p. 118.—Dr. Potter, together with the Article of the Church of England attributeth to the Church, nay to particular Churches (and I subscribe to his opinion) an authority of determining Controversies of faith according to plain and evident Scripture.

|| Of Fundamentals, p. 903.

|| Of Heresie, p. 115.

Scripture, and universal Tradition; & infallibility, whilst they proceed according to this Rule. And p. 200.—*The Fathers of the Church*

(saith he) in after-times [i.e. after the Apostles] might have just cause to declare their judgement touching the sense of some General Article of the Creed; but so oblige others to receive their Declarations under pain of damnation; what warrant they had I know not: He that can shew, either that the Church in all Ages was to have this authority, or that it continued in the Church for some Ages, and then expired: He that can shew either of these things, let him; for my part I cannot: Yet I willin. ly confesse the judgement of a Council, though not infallible, is yet so far directive and obliging, that (without apparent reason to the contrary) it may be sin to reject it, at least not to afford it an outward submission for publick peace sake. See Mr. Whitby,

p. 92.—*We do oppose it to the four first General Councils, not because we believe them infallible, but because we conceive them to agree with Scripture which is infallible; so that we make them secondary, not primary Guides; we reserve not our belief of their decrees into their authority, but into their agreement with Scripture; we do not say, we must believe this, or that, because any one of the first four General Councils hath defined it; but, because what the Council hath defined is evident in Scripture, therefore do we believe it: And if we should finde that in any Article they dissented from Scripture, we should in that as much oppose them, as we do you—and p. 451—I answer with D. Taylor, that either these Councils are tyed to the Rule of Gods Word, or not, if the first, then are they to be examined by it; and so be followed no further than they adhere to this unerring rule [examined:] He means by those persons, whom, yet, these Councils are to teach the sense of Scripture—and p. 15.—We generally acknowledge that no authority on earth obligeth to internal Assent. [This the firm ground (i.e. his own judgement, what Conciliary Decrees agree, or disagree with Scripture) that this young man builds on, for the confuting of Mr. Cressies book]*

See Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 58. 59, 133, 154, 252. and 375. 517. compared. There he saith on one side (p. 375—*That the Church of England looks on it as her duty to keep to the Decrees of the four General Councils, And—We profess (saith he) to be guided by the sense of Scripture, as interpreted by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and the four first General Councils—And p. 59 he saith, That the Church of England admits not anything to be delivered as the sense of Scripture, which is contrary to the consent of the Catholick-Church in the four first ages. [Here he seems to acknowledge a submission of Protestants to the consent of the Catholick-Church in the four first ages, and to the four first General Councils, as their Guide, for what is the sense*

of Scripture: which seems to me no way to conflict with a profession of submitting to the same Church or her Councils, only when, or as far as, they agree (in their Decrees), with the *sense* of Scripture: which last implies, that I learn the sense of Scripture not from *them*, but *another*; and assent to them, where they conform to that judgement, from which I learn it] *ibid*, He hath these two Propositions: —¹ *That it is a sufficient prescription against any thing, that can be alledged out of Scripture, that it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of the Scripture, if it appears contrary to the sense of the Catholick-Church from the beginning.* And this, —² *That such Doctrines may well be judged destructive to the Rule of Faith, which were so unanimously condemned by the Catholick-Church within that time.* [Where he allows not Christians to try, and so assent to, or dissent from, the Decrees of the Catholick-Church in her Councils, by what appears to them the sense of Scripture; but refers them to learn the sense of Scripture from the Decrees of these first Councils].

But yet on the other side he contends (how consistently, I leave to the Readers judgement) — *That the sense of the Catholick-Church is not pretended to be any infallible Rule of interpreting Scripture in all things, which concern the Rule of Faith.* And p. 71. concerning the necessity of believing the Articles of the *Athanasian Creed*, he saith, — *It is very unreasonable to imagine that the Church of England doth own that necessity purely on the account of the Church's Definitions of those things [therein], which are not Fundamental: it being Directly contrary to her sense in her 19th. and 20th. Articles.* And that hence the supposed necessity of the belief of the Articles of this Creed must, according to the sense of the Church of England, be resolved, either into necessity of the matters, or into that necessity, which supposeth clear convictions, that the things therein contained are of Divine Revelation. [resolved (he saith) either into the necessity of the matters ; But who is judg here whether the matters contained in this Creed are so necessary, or not ? the Councils that defined them ; or the Church of England ? If the Councils ; what if they mistake in it, as the Dr. holds they may ? Again, If the Councils are to judg of this necessity then the Church of England submits to it because of their defining it, which the Dr. endeavours to decline. Or, saith he, into that necessity which supposeth clear convictions i. e., that every one, that is convinced first by these Councils, that the matters contained in this Creed are Divine Revelations, or also necessary Truths; is obliged by the Councils to believe them such ; But here is no obedience; where indeed he cannot do otherwise, had not these Councils, but his servant, convinced him.]

Again p. 133. — *He describes*

describes the *Catholick-Church*, a society of such persons, who all firmly believe that *Doctrine* infallible, which *Christ* delivered; but yet judge themselves all fallible, and dare not usurp that royal prerogative of *Heaven*, in prescribing infallibly in matters questioned but leave all [men] to judge according to the *Pandects* of the divine Laws, because each member of this Society is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things, that tend thereto.

Thus he. And generally Protestants hold; that the *Church-Catholick* diffusive, of all ages; and therefore the *Catholick-Church*, of the four first; and therefore also the *General Councils* of the four first ages, though universally accepted, may err in *non-necessaries*; which is as much as to say; may give a wrong sense of *Scripture*, in them; notwithstanding that the *Church of England* obligeth Her self to the sense of this ancient Church; and this also, whilst she doth not know the *necessaries* from the other points, that are not so; and so neither knoweth, in what this ancient Church is not liable to error.

From these *Quotations*, I think it appears; that, whatever fair professions are made, yet no Assent is given by them to the first four Councils on this account, that they could not err in their Definitions: Nor yet, because they are their *Sovereign Judge*; from whose sentence they may not dissent, if they be perswaded, that it is repugnant to the *Scriptures*. And yet, of this repugnancy how they should come to any certain knowledge, I see no means. Certain I grant they may be, that the *Scriptures* are the Word of God; and again, certain of that, which the *Scripture* delivers, where the sense thereof is by all pronounced clear, and not ambiguous. But then: In a matter, where *Scripture* by several, and these in great numbers. and on both sides learned, is taken in a several sense; and the true sense thereof, is the thing in question; (as it is granted by *Dr. Stillingfleet* || to have been, even in some greatest Articles of the *Christian Faith*): and yet further ||, where it seems, the *Scripture* may be so doubtful, that the sense of the *Catholick-Church*, or its lawful *General Councils* (they say ||) can be to them no certain, or infallible, Interpreter of it: and lastly, where the judgement, or common Reason of a lawful *General Council* thinks it self so certain of the contrary, as to anathematize dissenters; On what grounds (here) any particular, Person, or Church, can assure themselves of their own sense of *Scripture* to be the true; they having left that of the *Church's Councils*, and of a major part of *Christianity*, who also, judge their sense false, I understand not. Surely, they will not say, they have this certainty from the *Scripture*; because the true sense thereof is the thing so mainly questioned; and the certainty, or in-

§. 42.

|| *Rat. Account*, p. 58.
|| See *Stilling.*
p. 59.
|| *Ibid.*

fallibility of the *traditive sense* of the Church they renounce; and then (which only is left) *their own judgement*, or *their own*, (which I see not how they rightly call) *common Reason*, when that of a General Council, or major part of Christianity, differs from it, one would think, should be a more fallible ground to them, than the judgment, or *common Reason* of the Church. □

This, of the Obedience of Assent denied, and that of silence, or non-contradiction only allowed, by them, to the Definitions of Councils.

§. 43.

But 1^{ly}. This obedience also of silence, and non-contradiction they allow not, 'as due to be yeilded absolutely to all Decrees of such Councils. [For, if they would but stand to this, the Church's peace were kept safe enough; for, so, there could never be any reformation (or publick teaching of the contrary) of such Decrees, as are once concluded by a General Council, but by a following General Council] ² *Nor yet as due to be yeilded to all Decrees of such Councils, that do not err manifestly against some Fundamental verity.*

|| p. 226.

† p. 534.

□ The Arch-Bishop || said this once, (repeated by Dr. Stillingfleet †) in these words. [*When private men know it, if the error of a Lawful General Council be not manifestly against Fundamental verity, in which case a General Council cannot easily err, I would have A. C. and all wise men consider, whether external obedience be not then to be yeilded. For, if Controversies arise in the Church, some end they must have, or they will tear all asunder*]. This he said once, but did not hold constant to it: for after, in the same Section, || he saith; [*Unless it err manifestly, and intollerably, and—if the error be neither Fundamental [then he adds] nor in it self manifest, it is safer to agree, &c.* For were non-contradiction thus far yeilded, seeing that neither the Catholick-Church before Luther, nor her Councils, have been held to have erred manifestly against any Fundamental verity (for so it would have lost the very essence of a Church), therefore all her subjects whatever would have stood obliged to her, and to her Councils, in the external obedience of silence at least; and thus her peace been always secure, and undisturbed. □

|| p. 227.

But only this silence to be yeilded to such Decrees, wherein the error of the Council is not manifest, or intollerable: Or (as Dr. Stillingfleet || expresseth it) where the error is not such, as overweighs the peace of the Church.

[Will. p. 506.

Now they affirm: that many errors, that are not in Fundamentals, or necessities strictly taken, may be such. For the Catholick (or if you will, the Roman) Church that was immediately

diately before *Luther*, they hold, erred not in Fundamentals; and yet they made a Reformation from it; as, mean while, erring many errors *manifest*, and *intolerable*; and they see it necessary to add these *manifest* errors to the other *Fundamental* errors, so to justify the Protestant's (former) proceeding.

But here again: if a *contradiction*, and breach of external obedience, or of silence in respect of such (imagined) *manifest*, and *intolerable* errors, were only allowed so far, as to the making a *peaceable complaint*, and representation thereof to their Ecclesiastical Superiors in present Being, for the assembling of another Council of equal authority to reverse it: (which is also mentioned by the Archbishop || and Dr. *Saillingfleet* †): and then, that, if these Superiors see no force in their Reasons, these Plaintiffs should here *acquiesce*, and return to their obedience of *silence*; thus also, the peace of the Church would be still continued.

§. 44.

|| p. 227.

† p. 537.

[And this seems still the more equitable, because the Protestant Writers, || *For preventing the exorbitances (as they say)* and capricious humours of fantastical Spirits †, and for the shutting out the whirl-winds of private Spirits from rustling the Church ||, do oblige those, who thus break silence, to bring demonstration against such error; and then, for the shutting out pretended demonstrations also, of which the world is full, define this demonstration to be such an evidence; as proposed to any man (and therefore to these Superiors) and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it; And therefore hence, one would think that, when these Superiors upon this proposal do not assent, the complainer ought to presume, his reasons, tendred to them, to be no demonstrations.]

|| Ap. Lawd.

p. 245. —

Hooker, pref.

p. 29.

† Still p. 540.

|| Ap. Lawd.

p. 245.

But next neither is this obedience of silence yielded obligatory in such a case; i. e. after that such complaint is made, and that the superiors declare, they see no just cause for it, nor reason demonstrative in it; but they further maintain

§. 45.

That a former General Council erring manifestly, and intolerably [i. e. in the imagination, and settled fancy of such a particular, person, or Church]; and the present Superiors (complained to) neglecting to call, or procure another General Council, to reverse such error, then an authority inferior may oppose, and publicly contradict such errors, of a former General Council; and an inferior Synod, National, or Provincial, for themselves may rescind such Decrees, and reform against them ||.

[For indeed this gap must necessarily be left open to let in *Luthers* reforming in the points mentioned §. 26, against the Decrees of several former Councils, that had found before in the Church a General acceptation, (for they main-

|| Ap. Lawd.

p. 227. — Dr.

Still. p. 534.

479.

tain.

See before,
§. 34.

tain [also, the whole Church liable to error in all such points, as they think fit to call *Non-necessaries*); and against the very *publick Service* of the whole Catholick-Church, which was in the Protestant computation, at *Luthers* appearance, of 900 years standing.]

And if a National, or Provincial Synod may claim such privilege to reform against a former *General Council*; I see no reason, why (much more) a *Province* may not claim it against a National Synod; a *Diocesse* against a Provincial; a *Presbyter* against his *Diocesan*; because these *inferior* Synods are still more liable to *manifest, intolerable* errors: And the Fundamental Reformation, by *Luther*, was the lowest of these, the Reformation of a *Presbyter* against his *Diocesan*.

§. 46.

Lastly, There remains yet one considerable more, as to qualifying this licence of publick *contradicting*; which, as it seems most reasonable; so, if it were observed, the Church's Unity, and Peace would yet suffer, by such contradictions, or reformations, no great diminution, or damage: Namely, that those *Inferiours* only, who think they can *evidence*, and *demonstrate* the errors of such Councils, may claim the privilege to speak, and teach publicly against them, or joyn with those that do so; but yet that so many, as do not pretend to have the like evidence, or demonstrations against the Superior's Doctrine, be instructed, that they stand so long obliged, in such case, to relinquish the *Inferiours*, and still to adhere, and submit to the *Superior's* judgment. [For Example, The *Bishop*, or a *Provincial Council* teaching one thing; the *Metropolitan*, or a *General Council* another; that it be confessed and made known, that so many of such *Diocese*, or *Province*, as cannot demonstrate what the *Bishop*, or *Provincial Council* maintain, are bound to continue their obedience still to the *Metropolitan*, or *General Council*, not to the *Provincial Council*, or *Bishop*]: For thus; there would be no more deserters of such Councils, and the former Church's Communion, no more Members of the Reformation, than are themselves pretenders of Demonstration; and those, I suppose, would not be many. But so it is, that these *inferior Guides* justify their *reforming* not only for themselves, but for all their Subjects too; so far as now, within their several Precincts, to impose an obedience of silence upon all, toward them, that cannot demonstrate against them.

This concerning the Protestants claimed liberty, * of breaking the obedience of *silence*; * of *complaining*; * of *reforming*, for themselves upon a neglect of their complaints, errors of Coun-

Councils, supposed by them manifest, and intolerable.

2^{ly}, Since errors intolerable, and manifest (they affirm) may be in any Decrees whatever of Councils, if such Councils be not (in their sense) universally accepted; or, of such also, as are so accepted, if their Decrees be made in non-necessaries: Next they contend, *That the judgment, when such Decrees of past Councils are errors, and those intolerable, and over-weighing a peace, and so these publicly contradictible and reformatable, is to be left to every particular, person, or Church.* ||

§. 47.

But, because this may seem of very ill consequence; Hear, how it is bounded and restrained.

This judgment (then) is not so left to them (saith the Arch-Bishop); That every private spirit may fall on reforming, what errors he fancies such; but that they bring such Evidence, and demonstration, as is described before ||, proving such to be manifest and intolerable errors: and then again, that the judgment of such demonstration, brought by them, be left to a future Council: which Council not allowing them for such, these inferiours are to acquiesce, as to silence at least, in its judgment. For (saith he ||) *if the Demonstration be evident to any man [according to the former definition they give it] then to so many Learned men, as are in a Council, doubtless: And if they cannot but assent to it, it is hard to think them so impious, that they will define against it. And if that which is thought evident to any man, be not evident to such a grave Assembly, it's probable, it is no Demonstration; and the producers of it ought to rest, and not to trouble the Church.* Thus he.

|| See Stillings.
P. 534, 292.

|| §. 44.

|| Ap. Laws,
P. 246.

But 1st, If the Ecclesiastical Superiours, upon this complaint, neglect to call such Council, the Arch-Bishop then makes every particular person, or Church, Judges, themselves, of their Demonstrations; upon which, he saith, They may proceed to reform, for themselves, such errors ||. But, say I, if the Demonstration be such, as is evident to any man, then so will it be to these Superiours complained to; & then, here the producers of it ought to rest. But this, he saw, would presently, stop the passage to all Reformation against Superiours; whereas the Council appealed to, (especially, such as they will allow) they see, is far enough off, from checking their pretended evidences: For what future Council can ever be hoped for, that will not be liable to most of their exceptions made against that of Trent; for the place; or for the calling of it; or for the Voters in it, &c. & till then, every private man's, or particular Church's demonstrations, as to reforming, stand in their full force, Power, and Vertue, in the Arch-Bishop's

|| Ap. Laws,
P. 245. & 227.
— Comp. §.
33. Confid. 6.
n. 1. with §.
32. n. 5.

stating,

stating this Point.

But then 2ly. Imagine we such a second Council called ; and this, for the lawfulness, and proceedings thereof, void of exception ; yet can it end no controversie any more, than the former ; nor is it more free from appeals ; for so long as this future Council, as well as the former, is liable to errors manifest, and intolerable, even in necessities, if it be not universally accepted ; or in non-necessaries, though it be so ; it follows, that such errors may be by private men discovered ; and new evidences out of the Scripture, or new demonstration may appear against them ; & so, upon the former terms, must be admitted a new complaint, and a new appeal to another future Council. For such resting of a former person in the conclusion of the Council, after his evidences heard and disallowed, infers not an acquiescence of all other persons whatever ; or yet, of the same person, whenever any other evidence, or demonstration, may appear to them, either against any other Definition of that Council, or even against that, which others upon mistaken grounds, questioned caustically ; for why may not one bring a true evidence, or demonstration against a point, and so ought to be heard ; after that, another, or the same, person hath brought a false one, and so is silenced ?

Thus is the freeing men from the Laws of their Superiors, like the breaking out of waters, by no device afterward to be stopped, where, or when we please.

So many evidences and demonstrations against a corporal Presence, in the Eucharist, being long ago presented to several Councils, and rejected as false, yet still new ones (or indeed the same) are pretended, to keep the controversie on foot, and bring it to another trial, where the Judge may be better informed.

§. 48.

¶ Rat. Account, p. 339.

After the Arch-bishop, Dr. Stillingfleet speaks to the same matter, on this manner. — If you ask (saith he) how it should be known, when errors are manifest, and intolerable, and when not ? We here appeal to Scripture interpreted by the concurrent sense of the Primitive Church, the common reason of mankind, (supposing the Scripture to be the Rule of Faith) ; the consent of wise and learned men ; which certainly will prevent the exorbitances, and capricious humors of fantastical spirits which may cry out, That the most received Truths, ever since Christianity was in the world, are intolerable errors. If you are resolved farther to ask ; Who shall be judge, what necessary reason, or demonstration is ? His Lordship tells you, I think plain enough from Hooker, what is understood by it ; viz. such, as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent unto it. And do you require any other Judge, but a man's own judgement, and reason, in this case ? But you say, O

call their Arguments Demonstrations : But let them submit to this way of tryal, and they may soon be convinced, that they are not : Still you say ; They will not be convinced, but will break the peace of the Church ; supposing, they have sufficient evidence for what they do. But, if men will be unreasonable, who can help it ? Thus Dr. Stillingfleet : I have set the place down at large, that you may better consider, what it amounts to. Here then : you see, he restrains this particular, *person's*, or *Church's* judgment of the *intolerableness* of such Council's error so, That this judgment be guided, or made, ' According to the interpretation of Scripture, by the concurrent sense of the Primitive Church, ' According to the common Reason of mankind, supposing Scripture the rule of Faith, ' According to the consent of Wise, and learned men. But first, methinks it is a very presumptuous thing for *Inferiors* to judge, by any of these ways, against a *General Council*. As if (for the first) these Councils did not Guide themselves by the concurrent sense of the Primitive Churches ; several of which Councils are reprehended by Protestants, for joyning *Church-Tradition* with *Scripture* it self, as a Rule of their Proceeding :

And again ; as if the concurrent sense of the Primitive Church did, either, for what is found to be generally held by it, or what is found not to be generally condemned by it, (according to the Protestants, or Dr. Stillingfleet's Principles) certainly clear any thing from its being still an intolerable error ; when as they hold, such *concurrent sense* may err in *Non-fundamentals* : and again hold, that, amongst these not Fundamentals, may be *intolerable* errors. See before §. 25 :

Next, as if (for the 2d.) General Councils did not use the same common Reason of mankind, and the same Rule of Faith, as a private man doth, for discerning errors : Or, as if he, by his *common Reason* Paramount, could discern, where their *common Reason* mistakes ; and that, *manifestly* and *intolerably* : Or, as if (for the 3d.) in these Councils were not a consent of wise, and learned men : Or, he knew other men more learned, than they ; or knew learned men better, than they.

But, to let these things pass : Yet, since the exorbitant, and capricious humors of some phantastical men may pretend most falsely and sillily any of these, *Antiquity* ; *common Reason* of mankind, grounded on Scripture ; or *the Learned*, on his side, against a General Council, pretend it, I say, most falsely, and sillily (of which who seeth not many Examples ?) Therefore, here it will not be enough for any, to say this ; but they are in all reason to shew some Evidence or Demonstration ; that these three or any of them, are for them.

And then, the same Question returns a-
gain

gain on Dr. Stillingfleet, who shall judge of this pretended *Evidence or Demonstration* of theirs? And he, both takes notice of it here, and answers it (if I understand Him aright) thus, That that man's own Reason, that pretends them, is also to be judge of them. For, if a *Demonstration* be such as being proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot chuse, but inwardly assent to it, then his mind also, that proposeth it, is thus convinced by it, and so knows it to be a *Demonstration*. And—*Do you require* (saith he) *any other Judge, but a Man's own Judgment and Reason, in this case?*

But such collection is very faulty: Because if it be true, that *Demonstrations*, (such as can be made in Divine matters) do *always* convince the mind, or effect its full assent: Yet it is not so, that *Demonstrations only* do this; but so also do many other false, though specious, Arguments. I mean, so convince the mind of some, as to produce a full assent free from doubting, though not from erring. But, to warrant any thing a *Demonstration* (according to the former Definition of it), not one, but all mens Reasons, that hear it, must assent to it; and then, amongst these, the reason also of our Superiors; and then, say one mans reason, as to a *Demonstration*, is sufficiently displayed, whenever all other reasonable men, to whom it is related, judge not the same with him. But, if *some mens* reason, when at any time opposing the *more common*, may be pretended a sufficient judge of *Demonstration*: Then we stick still at our former Question, How will this prevent the exorbitances, and capricious humours of pleastical Spirits? And how will not some break the peace of the Church still, supposing that they have sufficient evidence for what they say, when they have not? Therefore, after many windings, his utmost answer is.—*If men will be unreasonable, who can help it?* And so Mr. Chillingworth ||—*If, through his own default, any man judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it.* And || *Such persons endanger both his temporal and eternal happiness.* || Well; for such persons, at their peril be it:

But mean while; how is the Church's peace, or her wholefome, or also necessary, and Fundamental Doctrines, to be preserved amongst her Subjects? How those poor Sheep delivered from heathenry to, and being seduced by, these new *Demonstrations*, if such publick Contradictors may not justly be punished, and restrained by her? Or, how may they justly be restrained, if all ought to be left to judge according to the *Pandects of the Divine Law*, because each a *Member of the Christian Society* is bound to *take care of his soul, and of all things that next concern, as Dr. Stillingfleet will be.* || How restrained (I mean, even as to external

obc-

|| P. 59.

|| P. 100.

§. 50.

|| P. 133.

obedience, or silence), if the judgment, when or in what things
 her Councils intolerably err, is rightly left to them; and if, to
 often as they judge them to err, and persuade themselves they
 have demonstration for it, they may lawfully contradict? Could
 the Church-Governors justly punish *Luther*, and He justly do that,
 for which he was punished? Well: To give some satisfaction al-
 so to this [the preserving of the Church's peace], this goes on
 Dr. Stillingfleet. *We appeal* (saith he ||) *to the common Reason of* || p. 340.
Mankind, whether it be not a far probabler way, to end Controversies,
to persuade them, in disputable matters, to yield external obedience to
a lawful General Council; than to tell them, they are bound to believe
whatever they decree, to be infallibly true. But here he hides, and
 nimble passeth over one half, and the more scandalous part, of
 his Doctrine; and that, which usher'd in the Reformation; that,
 where a Doctrine of a General Council is intolerable, where it
 seems to any, not a matter disputable, but error manifest (of which
 he knows, who must judge; and how many of the common Do-
 ctrines of the Church, before the time of *Luther*, are by Prote-
 stants charged to be so: so that such errors are not to be numbred
 amongst the *raro contingentia* ||) there He and others say, so often || See Dr. Stil.
 may private men, or particular Churches, instead of yielding the P. 535.
 external obedience, he here makos shew of, publicly contradict
 such Councils; and reform. (I say not, without them; for that Pro-
 testants || do bring several proofs, or Examples, in Antiquity, || Ap. Lowd,
 but) against them: (for which they bring none). P. 153.

CHAP. V.

2. And concerning the Notion of Heresy and Schism.

13. Suitably to the Precedents, Protestants declaring Heresy to be an
 error obstinately maintained against some Fundamental Article of
 the Faith; without allowing any certain Judge, what Articles are
 Fundamental, and consequently, what is Heresy, §. 51.
14. Declaring Schism, in respect of inferiors to be a separation conse-
 less (§. 55. 2); Or, also (as some more straiten it,) a separation in
 Essentials, (§. 75. 2), from the Communion of other Churches, or
 of the Church-Catholic. But leaving us no certain Judge, what
 points are Essentials; or, when the separation consensens, and con-
 sequently, when Schism: (Unless, perhaps, be that separates be
 made by them this Judge.)

Bb 2

Again,

Again, enlarging Schism to Superiors also, so often as, by requiring unjust conditions of their Communion, they give their Subjects just cause of a separation. §. 61.

Where is examined: Whether the Ecclesiastical Superiors, when departing from no other their Superiors, can become, in respect of their Subjects, guilty of Schism, §. 63. n. 1.

A brief Reflection on the former different Theses of the two Churches concerning Church-Authority, and the Obedience due thereto, §. 64.

§. 51.

¶ See before, §. 16.

¶ Ch. II. 271.
332. Stilling.
p. 11.
¶ Ch. II. p. 332.
§. 12.

13. **L** Astly, Concerning their stating of *Heretic*, and *Schism*.

1st. For *Heretic*, They do not enlarge it so far, as Catholicks do, || to all errors knowingly, or obstinately maintained against any Church Definitions made in matters of Faith: But (which helps to remove the charge thereof the farther from themselves) restrain it || only to those errors, that are against some essential part of the Gospel, or some Fundamental Article of Faith, or such as is plainly revealed by God with a command that all should believe it †, or is absolutely necessary to the salvation of a Christian, and essential to the being of a Church.

§. 52.

¶ See before, §. 41. n. 2.

¶ See Stilling, p. 57.

Which Fundamentals, or necessities, they will not allow to extend so far, as to all the Articles contained in some of the Creeds ||: and some fetter them with so many conditions of an universal attestation from the Church of all times, as that scarce any former universally accounted *Heretic* can be found to oppose a Divine Truth, that is, in every circumstance, so qualified; viz. with such conditions as these ||:—That all Catholick writers agree in such a Doctrine, and none of them oppose it; and agree in the necessity of it also to all Christians; and that no later Writers, and Fathers, in heats of contention, and opposition of *Heretics*, judge it then an Article more necessary, than it was judged before. That all Writers, that give an account of the Faith of Christians, deliver it, not as necessary to be believed by such, as might be convinced, that it is divine Revelation; but as necessary also to be by all explicitly believed; That, what all these Writers consent in, be also undoubtedly the consent of the Church of those ages, wherein they write: Lastly, that it be made appear to be universally embraced at all times, and all places, by the Members of the Catholick-Church: & the opposers thereof, to have been presently disowned as any Members of it.

¶ See §. 4. p. 7.

¶ Somewhat a like Caution Bishop Taylor hath put in the beginning of his *Dissuasive* ||, to secure Protestants from receiving any detriment to their cause from the Fathers; and Antiquity; where, after he hath first collected, —That the Roman Tenents

Tenents were not believed; or practised in the three first ages, because the Writers of those ages [few, and compendious] are silent therein; [which is a faulty, Negative arguing, though the antecedent were granted for true]; and then; after he hath thus prejudiced the fourth age [i. e. the time of Athanasius, Basil, the three Gregories, Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, the first General Councils, and the first free exercise of Religion, and copious Records thereof] prejudiced it, I say, and the ages succeeding, That in those times secular interests did more prevail; and the writings of the Fathers were vast, and voluminous; full of controversy, and ambiguous senses, fitted to their own times, and questions; full of proper opinions, and such variety of Sayings, that both sides eternally, and inconfutably shall bring sayings for themselves respectively. After such prejudices, I say, he adds, that it is impossible for those of the Roman Church, to conclude from the sayings of a number of the fathers, that their Doctrine, which they would prove thence, was the Catholick Doctrine of the Church; Because (saith he) any number, that is less than all, does not prove a Catholick consent; and the clear saying of one, or two of these Fathers, truly alledged by us to the contrary, will certainly prove, that what many of them (suppose it) do affirm, and which but two or three, as good Catholicks as the other, do deny, was not then matter of Faith, or Doctrine of the Church; for, if it had, these had been Hereticks accounted, and would not have remained in the Communion of the Church. Thus, with him, if one or two of the Ancients, that are not therefore at that time accounted Hereticks for it, can be shewed to dissent, the concurrence of all the rest is held not sufficient to prove a Catholick Doctrine in a matter of Faith; nor such an accord of them sufficient to be called a Catholick consent; or such, as that all maintaining the contrary thereof, after it is declared by a Council to be such a Catholick Doctrine, will be Heresie: Whereas (contrary) it is manifest; both, that some Dissenters from a Catholick Doctrine of Faith (especially if it be not so universally evident as some others are, or be a consequential that is in those times not so much considered) are not therefore guilty of Heresie, before a more publick declaration and clearing of such points by a Council; (witness S. Cyprian; in the point of Non-rebaptization :) and yet, that the Doctrine may be truly called Catholick before the Council: and the Dissenters also perhaps not free from a culpable ignorance therein: For, if the dissent of some few Fathers in the Council (as in that of Nice, or Chalcedon) hinders not, that a Point may be declared (then) a Catholick Doctrine, neither doth the dissent of some few Fathers before the Council hinder, that then it was not a Catholick

lick Doctrine.

But to return to Dr. *Billingham*.

Such conditions, he saith, must the Point have, in which the Church-Catholick is unerring; and the obligation to believe, and conform to which is universal; and the opposite whereof is *Heresie*; which conditions if you please to apply to the Articles of Faith opposing the *Arrian*, *Nestorian*, or *Pelagian* Hereticks, you shall finde scarce any of them, but, that the Opposers thereof, upon a deficiency in some of these requisites, may withdraw his obedience thereto without any guilt of *Heresie*.

But, 2ly. They leave us also still uncertain; *which or how many* these Fundamentals, or necessities are: Or, who shall judge what points have, or have not, such an *universal attestation*, as they require from the Church; and therefore they leave us also uncertain, what is, or is not, *Heresie*; leave us also uncertain, by whose sentence, and judgment such Hereticks may be restrained, proceeded against, and punished; since they hold Councils no certain Judge concerning these Points, what are *necessary*, and *Fundamentals*, or *universally attested*, what not: and likewise, since they hold these Fundamentals, as to private men, varying according to a sufficient proposal of them; more Points being Fundamental to one, than to another ||; and consequently *by Heresie*, in opposing them, varying accordingly; they having cast off also that of the Church, from being a sufficient proposal for any ones conviction therein.

|| *Chill.* p. 137.

2nd lib. p. 98, 99.

§. 53.

And indeed, if, *1st*. Protestants maintain that no Councils or Church, without tyranny, may require *belief*, or *internal assent* from their Subjects to their Definitions, or Articles of Religion; (a practice much exclaimed against in the Church of *Rome*, and, if I misundertand them not, denied to be lawful, by several reformed); And 2ly. this be granted, that the *holding* of a Tenent contrary to some Fundamental Point, and not only the *outward profession*, and publick maintaining of such a Tenent, is *Heresie*; I see not, how the reformed Churches, though they should declare a particular Tenent to be an *Heresie*, yet can discover any *Heretick* whatever *painted his impiety*; publish his *Heresie*; nor how they can, or do, remove any such out of their Communion; or dissolve *ordained Orders* of; neither those, who hold such *Heretical Opinions*, stand anathematized by their Canons; nor there may be the extracting from such, entering into Orders, a confession of their *belief*, or an acknowledgement of any *internal assent* to the Articles of Religion: By which, some such Points, are also cast off of the Catholic Church. But, if it be maintained, *1st*. that it is the practice of the reformed Churches, or at least this of *England*, why

why is the requiring of such assent to, and belief of, the contrary of that which the decerns Heresie, blamed in the Roman?

Lastly, the description which is made by Dr. *Stillington*, || of that Catholick Church, which our Blessed Saviour instituted in the world (mentioned before §. 41.) seems to take away all such Judge upon earth, by whom Heresie can be discovered, or made known: for, if the Church-Governors cannot prescribe infallibly, [i. e. infallibly without mistake; for there is no need, that infallibly, here signifie any thing more] in any Controversie, on which side is Divine Truth; but—*That men are to be left herein to judge for themselves according to Scripture* [that is, what seems to them out of Scripture to be truth] because (saith he) every one is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that tend thereto; Then neither could the Fathers of Nice Judge concerning the *Consubstantiality of the Son* (a thing strongly questioned) and put it into the Creed. Nor those of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* judge so concerning one Person of our Lord, and 2. Natures, and put these in the Creed; Judge I say, so, as that others can be obliged to hold that to be Heresie in these points, which they pronounce so. Nor was there then any way to convince the *Arrians* infallibly of Heresie: but that they are still to be left to judge for themselves,—as bound to take care of their own souls, and of all things that tend thereto. The same may be said, much more, concerning *Pelagianism*, and other errors, formerly condemned for Heresie, which do expressly oppose no Articles in our Creeds. By this way then, an Ecclesiastical restraint of external profession there may be, but none of belief, or opinions; nor obstinacy in holding them, where no Obligation acknowledged to hold otherwise.

§. 54.

p. 153.

This of those, who express Heresie as an obstinate error against some Fundamental, or necessary article of faith universally attested such by the Church in the manner before mentioned.

But Dr. *Hammond* || somewhat more condescending, and enlarging the compass of Heresie, though he makes it indeed to be an opposition of the Faith (in any one, or more branches of it) by way of Emphasis, and excellence, that was once delivered to the Saints, and that was seen by Christ (or his Apostles from him) to be by all Men believed to their Righteousness, and confessed to their Salvation. And an opposition of such faith (saith he ||) as descends to us from the Apostles by a Catholick Testimony truly such, i. e. universally in all respects; of place, time, and person. Yet doth he so expound this universal Testimony, || as to signifie only the consent of the most, in most places, in all, or most times; For *slife* (saith he †) there would

|| Of Heresie;

§. 2. n. 11.

p. 70.

|| §. 5. n. 3.

|| See Ibid. n.

2. §. 10.

† §. 5. n. 2.

would be no Hereticks at any time in World : [*Viz.* If those only should be held such necessary Articles of our faith, which all, none excepted, in all times, do hold.] And again, ^a he makes use of the Church's *Councils* for convincing *Hereses* against this faith, *Viz.* of the four 1st. General Councils; saying, That all the parts of this faith are compleatly comprehended in the *Scriptures*, as explained by the Writers of the three first ages, and definitions of the four first Councils; so that in sum, he who embraceth all the Traditional Doctrines proposed by them, embraceth all the necessary faith thus universally delivered, (which cannot come to the fifth age, &c. but through the fourth and third;) and so can be no Heretick. (See 7. §. 6, 7, 8. n.) His words there (n. 7.) are, *Of the Scriptures, of the Creed, and of those four Councils, as the Repositories of all true Apostolical Tradition I suppose it very regular to affirm; that the entire Body of the Catholick Faith is to be established, and all Heresies convinced; or else, that there is no just reason that any Doctrine should be condemned, as such.* And, see what is cited out of him concerning these Councils, before, §. 19. and of *Herese*, §. 14. n. 10. But here, since he admits *Councils* for convincing *Herese*, why reits he in the *four first*? and why admits he not all *Councils* in whatever age, (that are of equal authority) for the same discovery, since many new errors against *traditive* Faith may arise after the four first, and the Church's later Councils, accordingly, may testifie, and declare the same Faith (as occasions are administred) against them? If it be said, that what is *traditive* in any latter age, wherein some latter Council is held, was so in the third or fourth; and so all *Herese* is sufficiently convinced by those ages; then so were the Definitions of the four first Councils *traditive* in the first, second, or third age: And therefore what need hath Dr. *Hammond* to add for conviction of *Herese*, these *four first Councils*, which were held after the three first Centuries?

The sum is: For convincing *Herese*, either the testification of all lawful General Councils is authentical; or not that of the four first. But, if the Doctor allow all lawful General Councils to be so, (as some thing seems said by him to this purpose, *Herese* §. 14. n. 1. 2.). Catholicks are at accord with him herein, concerning the *Nature* and *Trial* of *Herese*; and the dispute only remains, whether any of those Councils, that have heretofore defined, or testified any such Point of Faith *traditive*, which is opposed by Protestants, be such a *lawful General Council*: Concerning which, see in 1. *Disc.* §. 30. &c.—§. 75. §. 57. &c.

¶ Reply to B.
Chalced. c. 2.
p. 102.

Thus Dr. *Hammond*; restraining conviction of all *Herese* within the time of the first Councils. But Bishop *Bramhall* || seems

to be yet more free—I acknowledge (saith he), that a General Council may make that revealed Truth necessary to be believed by a Christian as a point of Faith, which formerly was not necessary to be believed; that is whensoever the Reasons, and grounds produced by the Council, or the authority of the Council (which is and always ought to be, very great, with all sober discreet Christians) do convince a man, in his conscience of the truth of the Council's definition. And in Vindication of the Church of England; p. 26.—When inferior Questions, not Fundamental, are once defined by a lawful General Council, all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgements, are obliged to passive obedience; to possess their souls in Patience. And they who shall oppose the authority, and disturb the peace, of the Church deserve to be punished as Hereticks. Here, though the Bishop makes not the opposers of the Council's definition, for the reason of opposing it, Hereticks, because he holds that no error, but that, which some way overthrows a fundamental Truth, can be Heretical; and though, in this holding, that Councils may not prescribe what things are fundamental; nor oblige any to assent to their judgment in what they do define, further than their reasons convince them, He, as he felt, leaves Hereticks undiscoverable; yet he grants, that all are to submit, for non-contradiction, to the determinations of Legal General Councils, even in all inferior points not fundamental; and that the opposers deserve to be punished as Hereticks; which, if observed by Protestants, would sufficiently keep the Church's peace; and then, concerning the past definitions of such Councils, see what is argued with him, in 1. Disc. § 30. &c. This for Heresie.

12ly. For Schism. Neither do they enlarge it so far as Catholics, That any separation upon what cause soever, from the external Communion, of all particular former Churches; or, of our lawful Ecclesiastical Superiors; or, of the whole Church-Catholic; is Schism, but restrain it to be a separation culpable, or causeless; || holding that some separation from them may not be so.)

Chillingw.
p. 271.

But they leave us here again in uncertainty, between these Superiors, and Inferiors, which of them shall judge, when such separation is causeless, when other wise: and so uncertain of Schism: or also they affirm, that the Inferiors are to judge, when their Superiors require unjust things as conditions of their Communion; & so, when a separation from them is lawful, or culpable. Of which thus Dr. Stillingfleet, || Nothing can be more unreasonable, than that the society imposing certain conditions of Com-
munion,

§. 56.

p. 292.

union should be judge, whether these conditions be just and equitable, or no. And the same thing may thus be produced from other Protestant Tenents; For they hold, that the whole Church is infallibly only in absolute Necessaries, or Fundamentals; errable in other matters of faith; that its Governors, collected in their Supreme Councils, may also enjoin such errors as conditions of their Communion; that these errors, at least some of them, may be certainly and demonstratively discernable by Inferiours; and, these being complained of, and not amended by Superiours, that they may lawfully separate, in the sense explained before, §. 20. from such Communion, wherein these conditions of it are imposed: Here therefore inferiours judge, when the separation is just, when causeless; and upon this account surely no separation will ever be, I do not say Schism, but discovered to be Schism, if the Separatist, is to Judge, when it is so. But if the Superiours are to Judge, when a separation from them, and from their definitions imposed, is culpable, or causeless, it will either be always judged such (which is the Catholicks Doctrine); or such a granted just cause will be removed by these Superiours; and so there will be no separation at all. This concerning some Protestants restraining Schism to culpable, or causeless separation.

§. 57. Again; some of them there are, who straiten Schism yet farther; || See Scallan. ther; || and, making it, a separation only from other Christians, or Churches, in such things, wherein it is absolutely necessary to be united with them, (which is thus far gone); then state this necessary union to consist only in the belief of those Fundamental Articles, of Faith, p. 94. 56. --- or Doctrine, which are absolutely necessary to Salvation, or essential to the being of a Church.

§. 58.

Where they hold it not Schism, to separate from all particular Churches of the present age for a Doctrine universally held, and imposed as a condition of their Communion, because they say, an error may be so imposed. But only Schism, to separate from the Primitive and Universal Church for Doctrine, 155. That can be made appear to have been Catholick, and universally received (in the manner expressed before, §. 52.) by the Church of all ages, successively from the Apostles to the time of such separation. And 2ly. That can also be proved a Doctrine necessary to salvation, and essential to the being of a Church.

|| p. 377.

For the first of these, Dr. Scallan's words || to this purpose (in answer, to the unlawfulness of reforming former Catholick Doctrines) are, --- It is not enough (saith he) to prove any Doctrine to be Catholick, that it was generally received by Christian Churches in any one age; but it must be made appear, to have been so received

remained from the Apostles time; nor to say, that A.D. 317, such
and such Distincts were looked on as Catholick and therefore they were
for One thus for 1517. years successively from the Apostles to this
time they were judged to be so; and then (saith he) we shall more easily
believe you: And p. 337. he saith, That we are to measure the
Communion of the Catholick-Church, by the judgements of all, or
most of, the particular Churches of such an age. And for
the second, In the 2d. Part, c. 2. proving Protestants not guilty
of Schism, (p. 331.) he saith, —Who so separates from any parti-
cular Church (much more from all) for such things, without which there
can be no Church, separates from the Communion of the Catholick-
Church; but he that separates only from particular Churches (any or
all) as to such things, which concern not their being, is only separa-
ted from the Communion of those Churches, not the Catholick. And
therefore (saith he) supposing that all particular Churches have some
errors and corruptions in them, though I should separate from them all,
[for such errors; but what if separate from the external Communi-
on of my lawfull Ecclesiastical Superiours for some truth, though
this not Fundamental?] I do not separate from the Communion of the
whole Church, unless it be for something, without which there could be
no Churches. —And p. 335. —No Church can be charged with a se-
paration from the true Catholick-Church; but what may be proved to
separate is self in something necessary to the being of the Catholick-
Church; and so long as it hath not separate as to these essentials, it can-
not cease to be a true Member of the Catholick-Church. This in some
sense, of which see below §. 60. n. 3. may be granted: But what are
these he holds Essentials to the being of the Church-Catholick? p.
337. he saith, —That the Communion of the Church-Catholick lies
open to all such, who own the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith &c
And (p. 234.) he saith, —All that is meant by saying, that the pro-
fessant Church [he means Catholick] is infallible in Fundamentals;
is, that there shall always be a Church; for, that which makes them a
Church, is the belief of Fundamentals; and if they believe not them,
they cease to be so. That therefore, which being supposed, a Church
is; and, being destroyed, it ceaseth to be, is the formal constitution of
it; but thus it is, as to the Church, the belief of Fundamentals makes
it a Church, and the not belief of them make them cease to be a Chris-
tian Church. Well: But what are these necessities or Fundamentals
of the Christian Faith, that we may know, how long a person, or
Church, retaineth the Communion of the Catholick: See (then)
concerning this, p. 33. 34, 35. —These are such points (saith he) as
are required, by God or necessary to be explicitly believed by all, in
order to obtain salvation. And which are they? —p. 36.

Nothing ought to be required as a necessary Article of Faith, but what hath been believed, and received for such by the Catholick Church of all Ages. And afterward What hath been admitted into the ancient Creeds. *

Here then I take his Tenent to be—That no more is necessary to render any person, or, Church free from Schism, and a true Member of the Catholick Church, and continuing in its Communion, than the true belief of all Fundamentals, or points absolutely necessary to be believed for attaining Salvation.

§. 59.

But here also : 1st. These leave us uncertain, how particularly to know, and distinguish these *Fundamentals* and *Essentials*, wherein only is *Schism*, from other points that are not so ; or they do infold all these essentials within the compass of the *Creeds* ; where also they contend, that they must not be extended to all the Articles thereof ; whence it will follow, that one departing from the Church's Communion, for requiring his assent, as a condition thereof, in respect of some of these Articles, yet will be no *Schismatick*, as they state Schism : Nor, none a *Schismatick*, that is not, even in a Fundamental, an *Heresick*. Again, since several Doctrines there are, that are delivered by all former ages, which yet are not Fundamental, or Essential to Salvation, or to the being of a Church, thus the separating, from all particular Churches, or from our spiritual Superiours, for any Doctrine taken for such, will not be *Schism*. So one, that separates from the Communion of his Superiours, for their requiring his assent, and conformity to the Episcopal Government of the Church, though he is a *Schismatick* in Dr. *Hammonds* account ||, yet must be none, in Dr. *Stillingfleets* ; unless he will make Episcopacy essential to the being of a Church ; (concerning which I refer you to his *Trenicam*) and so pronounce the Presbyterian, and Transmarine reformed Congregations, no Churches of Christ. The same may be said of any, separating from the external Communion of his Superiours, requiring of him consent, and conformity to the Definitions of the first four allowed General Councils, and the Constitutions of the universal Church of the first, and purest Ages, whether in Government, or other, the like observances, and practices ; which separation is by Dr. *Hammond* || declared Schism but cannot be so upon Dr. *Stillingfleets* Theses ; unless all these will be maintained by him *Fundamentals*, and *Essentials* to the being of the Catholick Church, I mean as to faith necessary for her attaining Salvation. Lastly, Dr. *Stillingfleet* saith, || a Church, enjoying some dangerous errors, as necessary conditions of her Communion, upon Excommunication to those who do not submit, by this becomes divided from the

|| *Schism*.
p. 163.

|| *Schisme*.
p. 156. 160.

|| p. 356.

the Communion of the Church-Catholick; but then, it is so, without its denying any Fundamental point of Faith; its crime is only being the imposing of some Non-fundamental errors to be believed, upon pain of Excommunication. By their restriction of Catholick Doctrines to those only, which can be made appear to have been so received, not only by the Catholick Church of the present, but also of all former ages from the Apostles, they may separate from a lawful General Council of the present age, universally accepted, without any guilt of *Schism*, or their opposing, by this, any Catholick Doctrine in their sense; (unless they will say; such Councils can define, or the present age universally accept, no Doctrine fundamental or not fundamental, but what hath been the explicate Faith of all former ages). And by such restriction they seem to require most unequal conditions of their obedience and conformity to the present Church-Catholick; when they will allow a necessity of such conformity to no Doctrine of hers, upon any cheaper terms, than the producing a written evidence [and that, I suppose they mean, not of some Principles thereof; but of the Conclusion it self] for it, in all ages for 1600 years. A large field chosen, wherein to continue the dispute. Now, all Church-Tradition is not necessarily written; all former writings, not necessarily descending to the present age; and so, many Doctrines may be universal, that cannot be made appear in the Church-Records of every age to be so; and it seems enough, to infer the obedience of Inferiours, if the Inferiours cannot shew, in the former Church-Records, the contrary doctrine held in any age, to that maintained in the present.

3ly. If the Catholick Doctrine of the present age be in a matter necessary; the Church of the present age must be unerring in it; and its Testimony sufficient to enforce a conformity, upon pain of *Schism*, without farther search into former ages. (For the Catholick Church of every age is unerring in necessities.) If in some matter not necessary; the testimony of the Church of all ages (excepting the Apostles only) with them is not sufficient; which (as they say) may mistake in it; and therefore the retiring to these former ages will not be sufficient to prove it a Truth; or a departure from it, *Schism*. But if they say; in the testimony of former ages, they include the testimony of the Apostles also; then, that alone will be sufficient to authorize a Catholick Doctrine, without the Church's witness given thereto in any age; or, without that the Church's witness is nothing worth; and then, why press they this universal Testimony of the Church?

4. But lastly, this their affirming, the Constitution and Essence of the

§. 60. n. 1.

§. 60. n. 2.

§. 60. n. 3.

the Catholick Church, to be only a right Belief in Fundamentals; and allowing the Communion of this Church, and a Security from Schisms to all such persons, and Churches, as are in these Fundamentals no way deficient, is very faulty, and contrary to the ordinary notion, which both the ancient Fathers, and Learned Protestants have of the Catholick Communion; and of Schism. ¶ It is true; that, as the Catholick Church is a company of right Believers, as to the Faith absolutely required for attaining Salvation no more is necessary to its constitution, or being, than the Faith only of some points, which, for this reason, are called Fundamentals; but, as it is also One Society, or Body, wherein the several Members are united in the Bond of Peace, under lawful Pastors and Guides, and subjected to certain Laws of Government and Discipline. ¶ So many more things both in respect of the Pluritude of Faiths, and Sanctity of Manners, according to the divine Revelations, and Commands made known by these his Ministers, are necessary to the Being, and Constitution thereof; all which being put, any particular Person, or Church is a true Member of the Church Catholick. But, any of them wanting, though the rest be present, it ceaseth to be Catholick. And such a Church Catholick is affirmed to be always extant, not only as shall believe aright in all Fundamentals, but the Members of which shall always be united also in all other points of Faith, and practice of holiness, conducing to Salvation, and the Subjects therein obedient to their Superiours, in all their lawful decrees, and injunctions. So that a person, or Church, most faulty Orthodox as to all Fundamental Faith, yet may want some Essentials of Unity, necessary to the being a Member of the Catholick Church, if such person, or Church shall divide from the Communion thereof, for any lawful Definition made, or practice enjoined, by his Superiours, even in Non-fundamentals. So, the Novatian, and Donatist Churches perfectly agreeing with the Catholick, as to all Fundamental Faith, yet became non-Catholick, and Schismatics for relinquishing the Communion of the whole, in opposition to some matters not Fundamental, when once defined, and stated by it, the one, for the reception into the Church of great sinners after Baptism; penitent; the other, for non-rebaptizing of Hereticks converted. Therefore of these later, St. Austin saith, *Non estis in baptismo, in Symbolo, in ceteris Dominicis Sacramentis. In ipsis autem unitatis, et inviolabilis pacis, in ipsa domini, Catholica Ecclesia nobiscum non estis.* In Symbolo, & Sacramentis they agree; but yet, not in Catholica Ecclesia, because not in ipsis unitatis, et pacis, i. e. not in a due Subordination, and Subjection, as to

|| Ep. 48.

to some other universal decrees of their Mother, the Catholick Church, in which they were *Harmical*, and *Schismatical* (of which see before, § 18.)

To the compleat *Being* and *Essence* of this Church, as Catholick (then), there is required; not only, that there be *unity*; but *unum corpus* (Eph. 4. 4, 5.) under subordinate Governors (verse 11.); not only *unity* in *Symbols*, & *Sacraments*; but *it* in *doctrine*; and it extends to all obedience, and subjection of Inferiours to their Superiours, of the parts to the Laws, and constitutions of the whole: for want of which latter the Donatists, Orthodox as to all Fundamentals, yet are said not to be in *Eccl[esi]astical* Catholick.

And these other necessary properties of a true Member of the Church Catholick, besides that of a right belief in Fundamentals, are freely also confessed by learned Protestants. Of which thus Dr. Field, *[¶]* This entire profession of the truth revealed in Christ, though it distinguish right Believers from Heretics, yet it is not proper [quarto modo] for the happy number, and blessed company of Catholick Christians, because Schismaticks only, and some times do, hold an entire profession of the truth of God, revealed in Christ. And afterwards *[¶]* themselves (saith he) thus perpetually distinguish the true Catholick Church from all other Societies of men, and professions of Religions in the world, are these: First, The entire profession of supernatural virtues, which God hath revealed in Christ his Son. 2^{ly} The use of such holy Ordinances and Sacraments, as he hath instituted and appointed; 3^{ly} the Union, or communion of men in the Profession, and use of those Sacraments, under lawful Pastors and Guides, appointed, authorized, and sanctified to direct, and lead them in the happy way of eternal Salvation! A particular person, or Church therefore, having the two first properties, yet failing in the last, *[¶]* communion, and communion with the whole under its lawful Superiours (of which see 2^d Diss. § 249) wants something necessary to the Being of a Member of the Catholick Church. And see also, Dr. Field *[¶]* *[i. e. Catholick]*; because, *[¶]* Though they retain an entire profession of the truth of God, as did (saith he) the Luciferians, and some others, in the beginning of their Schism; yet they break the Unity of the Church, and refuse to submit themselves, and yield obedience to their Pastors and Guides, and their Communion, and communion with the rest of Gods people is at some things only: and not absolutely in all wherein they have, and ought to have fellowship. Thus Dr. Field, and much what the same you may find in Dr. Field quoted before in 2^d Diss. § 24. who on this account makes Protestants, Schismaticks.

§ 60, p. 4.

1. 2. c. 2.

1. 2. c. 2.

The Case between the Churches? Next p. 50.

see

|| c. 2. §. 3.

|| c. 3. §. 9.

|| Reply to
Chalesd. p. 8

See Dr. Hammond's Treatise of Schism: where, he makes, — that
 Unity of the Catholick Church, of which Schism is a breach, to
 consist, — In the preserving all those Relations, wherein each Mem-
 ber is concern'd one towards another, amongst which is that of subor-
 dination; the Unity whereof consists in a constant due subjection, and
 obedience of all inferiours to all their Superiours, &c. || — And the de-
 nyng this obedience, in any particular lawful command of these Su-
 peniours; or the casting off all obedience together, & deboning them &c.
 to be Schism. || [But this lawful command, and so Schism, in diso-
 obeying it, may be in no Fundamental point]. Lastly, thus
 Bishop Bramhall; || That all Schism is about Essentials of Religion is
 a strange paradox. Many Schisms have arisen in the Church about
 Rites and Ceremonies, about precedency, about Jurisdiction, about
 Rights, and Liberties of particular Churches, about none of fact.
 Obstinacy in a small matter is enough to make a Schism. From all
 these I think it is clear, that a separation from the Communion
 of the Church Catholick, or our lawful Superiours, for anything
 true, or lawfull, the practice of belief, of which is enjoynd by
 her as a condition of her Communion, though this be not in Fun-
 damentals, is Schisme, and inconsistent with being a true member
 of the Catholick Church: learned Protestants consenting.

And then; to learn, in matters controverted, and doubtful,
 what is True, and what is lawfull, we know to whose judgment,
 Inferiours, and Subjects are directed to repair, and if they will
 sit in Moses's chair themselves and judge it, and happen to mistake,
 I leave them to read their doom in D. Hammond. 12. of Schisme
 §. 8. — Now, which way soever they turn, sure to Sin; remaining in
 Error and Schisme on the one side [if they desert upon this judg-
 ment, the Churches Communion] and by flying from that, advan-
 cing in lying and Hypocrisy on the other side [i. e. if they external-
 ly profess contrary to their perswasion]. This (from §. 3. 4.)
 concerning some Protestants retaining Schisms to a departure in
 the Essentials of Religion.

§. 61.

But the same persons, though they contract Schisme thus,
 in the case of Inferiours, yet in another way they enlarge it, when
 Catholicks do not admit it; namely to the Church, & Communion
 of themselves. Affirming, — That they, even in the same most
 Body of them, Lawful General Councils, may create new Synodes,
 &c. and impose unjust conditions of their Communion, followed with
 an Excommunication of non-conformists. — Thus, —
 so often as they do so, they, — that is, the Church, — do
 create the guilt of Schism, — and thereby become divided themselves
 from

Archb.
Land.

p. 33. 142.

from the Communion of the Church Catholic, but do not divide the Church into two parts, as the Protestants do. † Scilling & p. 356. &c.

For instance, suppose the General Council consisting both of the Eastern and Western Churches, and General Synods were put together before the times of Luther, and were to discuss the same points as the Protestants in the Reformation; to the first point of St. Hieronim's, to the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. (as they ought to do), that, if both the Churches did not, yet possibly they might, because Protestants say, 'That the whole may be in one fundamental; and that these points are such, as they cannot be separated; and that the Government of the whole Christian world would become schismatical, and no longer members of the Church Catholic.' On this point, Scilling's words to this purpose are short: 'Suppose any Church (although preceding to be never so Catholic) doth restrain her Communion with such a doctrine, and unjustly, that she doth it in such a manner, which doth not appear all together to be such a doctrine, as is necessary in practice, which the Communion of such a Church should be to; i. e. when the errors, and corruptions are such, as are dangerous to Salvation, that Church becomes thereby divided from the Communion of the Catholic Church; and all such who dissent from such an ungodly doctrine, do not so much divide from the Communion of that Church as including, as returning to the Communion of the primitive and apostolical Church; and (p. 359.) the faith, wherein Churchmen are such as are in faith, opposed to essential things, the necessary conditions of Communion, so as to cast them out of the Church, who would never so them, thereby divides in self from the Catholic Church, and the separation from it is so far from being schismatical, that being a part of the Church, in the same way, remains the same in the Communion of the Catholic Church; and p. 367. he saith, 'Then, he cannot possibly distinguish the difference between the judgment of the Catholic Church concerning the Donatists, which Catholics pronounced them schismatical, and no members of the Church Catholic; and of the Protestants concerning the Church of Rome; as he doth here.' p. 359.

But here it is from this assertion, that the Church, which requires unjust things as conditions of her Communion, both hereupon divide her self, and so becomes divided from the Church Catholic; and again, that these are unjust conditions of Communion, which Protestants have styled such, as are following: 1. That since the Reformation, the Eastern and Greek Churches, as well as Western and Roman Churches do not require such conditions of their Communion, and even in their publick Liturgies (as was shewed) which Protestants call unjust; therefore the Eastern as well as Western according to their thesis must stand divided from the Church.

359.

§. 62.

HP. 356.

res. q. 9. 11
810. 9

§. 63. n. 2.

§. 64. n. 2.

811. 3. 3.

lentissimum in seipso.

2. Nor, though this should be granted, and also that they excommunicate those that refuse to conform, can they thereby become guilty of *Schism*. For *Schism*, (I mean, such as separates, and divides from the Catholick Church), can never be of a much major and more dignified part, in respect of a less, and Inferiour, subject to it: i. e. the main body, be a *Schismatick* from some single member thereof: for this main body, in any division, is rightly taken for *that which it* (see 2d. Disc. §. 25.) from which a separation is *Schisme*; and to which every member ought to adhere, as to the body, and the head here upon earth to which it belongs. The sin of *Schisme*, I say, is of a member departing from the Body, not of the Body separating from a member, (or separating a member from it) to which each member ought to conform; otherwise a division in the Church indeed may be seen: but, on what side the crime of *Schisme* is, cannot, by any certain Index of it, be known; and St. *Austin's* mark of *Schismaticks* — *Qui non communicant honeste, sed in aliqua parte separata*, will be fallacious, and nothing worth. Meanwhile it is not here denied, that the dividing of one or several Superiours from an Inferiour part, if it be for any thing, wherein such part, not they, doth agree with the whole, may be *Schisme*; but that, which makes this *Schisme*, is the departure of such Superiours from their Superiours, or from the whole, with which this part coheres: and when any Superiour makes any such division from his Subjects, he is no longer their lawful Superiour; but that larger body and those Superiours of his, to which his Subjects are joyned, and from which he divided. Again, since *Schisme* is alwaies a relinquishing of, and departure from, the external, and visible Communion of the Church, these Governours cannot be said to depart from that Communion, which they still retain in the same manner, as formerly, and which is the only visible Communion of the Church, at the time of such excommunication. External members of the Church therefore they still remain, and so no *Schismaticks*; though at the same persons, or many of them, by some other mortall sin, may be, at the same time, no internal members of it. Before the Synod held at *Down*, the *Contra-Remonstrants* had in severall places excluded the *Remonstrants* from their Communion. Upon this when the Synod met, which consisted mostly of these *Contra-Remonstrants* as being the main Body of the *Belgick* Clergy, the *Remonstrants* refused any submission to it, under this pretence among others that they were *Schismaticks*; In which accusation the Divines went further: by the King of England made this Apology for the Synod *At. Syn.*

En. ed. 2

De Onu.
Eccle. 6. 2.

Lastly, Neither doth it hold, that those that cannot do
themselves from the Church Catholick by any
schism, whereby they do externally (but not internally) cut off
another person from it: Supposing indeed, that after all
such Ecclesiastical division where, the two parties can no
longer remain members of the same body, this were most true, that
he (being innocent) remaining still a member of *Christ's body*,
the Church ought to be so; but so it is, that the Excommunication
of an innocent may happen by many accidents, without any fault
of the Excommunicated; or, if a fault, no *moral* one, and such,
as internally separates from the Body of Christ. This, of the
Excommunication of *Henry and Schism*.

§. 64.

And thus much of the chief Differences of the two Churches
concerning Church authority, and the discipline due thereto.
Where, I think the distressed, and considerate, may clearly
see, that, for that, wherein the Arch-Bishop, and
others, have appeared to Catholics not able to maintain them-
selves from maintaining a Church authority for deciding
all controversies, and suppressing all Sects; and yet, with it,
rejecting the authority of the Church publicly to condemn it, and re-
fusing its authority, whenever in their judgment thought
proper. Dr. *Stillingfleet's* new defence hath no way re-
solved them, but left them in their former state.

§. 64.
Reflection.

That the one, the Catholick way here above men-
tioned, maintains *unity*, and constant submission of private
judgments, and so tends effectually to preserving Christian Reli-
gion, and Faith still the same, and united, as it descendeth through
several ages; but the other maintains *liberty* of private judgments,
and so continually varies, and divides it; That one builds,
and sets up *Ecclesiastical authority*, and its supreme Tribunals, the
Councils; The other, by several ways, goes about to weaken, and
frustrate them; whilst it makes Councils Judges, and de-
ciders of Controversies; and then private men Judges, whether
the Councils have judged right, or erred in their decisions; and
whilst, by asking many questions, and moving many scruples,
(some of which I have set down below ||), they endeavour to
make a General lawful obligatory Council, in the former ages,
to be a thing very rare, and difficult to be found; or certainly
known:

§. 65.

Have Powers, to dissolve in Ecclesiastical Coun-
cils in all ages? I wish you could prove any Ecclesiastical Council in
any age, hath Dr. *Stillingfleet* ||. And it is certain, that no
General Council, since the Council of *Constance*, hath been
possible,

|| §. 86. &c.

|| p. 253.

§. 66.

possible, said Mr. Whalley. And these, and a hundred questions more (saith he), of the persons appointed to call them, of the place, and the like, might be insisted on to show, that General Councils were never instituted by God, for the rule of our Faith. And, when such Council found, give them as little comfort, or confidence in it, by their taking much pains, and spending a great part of their Books, to shew, and prove the liability of these Councils to error, even in Fundamentals. All which is but the telling an intelligent disinterested person, that neither such Councils, as could heretofore be assembled, have been their friends, nor the future are hoped to be so.

§. 66.

Lastly, they may set, that, if the former, the Roman-Catholick, way be taken; all, or most of those *Controversies* between *Catholicks*, and *Protestants* have been decided by those Councils, which, before the times of *Ember*, the whole Western Church (in which the *Controversies* arose) unanimously accepted, and allowed; (an instance hath been made in the 1st. *Disc.* §. 57.) touching *Transubstantiation*. Or also several of them, by the very publick service of the whole Catholick Church; a Service, as universally accepted, as the Councils. But if the latter, the Protestant, way be taken, these *Controversies* must still remain, and the way is open for any particular person, or Church (according to their apprehension of the magnitude of the Church's errors, and of their certainty of this) to raise more, till the end of the world.

CHAP. VI.

The Face of the two present Churches, compared with that of the Ancient.

A Review, which of the two present Churches most resembles the Ancient Catholick Church §. 67.

The Face of the Ancient Catholick Church, §. 68.

Of the present Roman Church, §. 69.

Of the present Protestant Church, §. 70.

§. 67. n. 1.

Here remain yet these things, that seem necessary to be added, before I conclude the discourse.

The first; a brief Survey of the different constitution and complexion, of these two present Churches compared with the ancient, and Primitive; thus to see, which of them more resembles her;

her; and which seems rather to be Her true Daughter, to whom both pretend, as their *Mother*; that we may not demer to render our selves wholly to the conduct of that present Church, on whom we perceive to have descended the vigor, Spirit, and authority of the ancient.

Where also that shall be more particularly examined, Whether Protestants or at least the Church of England however, professing the contrary, doth not *de facto* stand guilty of the Tyranny, whereof she accuseth the Roman Church, and for which she separated from Her, in her Requiring from her Subjects that Obedience of Assent which yet she hath denied to her Canonical Superiours.

The second, A Reflection on the present Eastern Churches, to see with which of the other two, the Roman or the Protestant, they consent, as to the chief Modern Controversies.

The third, a Solution of those many difficulties and Objections, produced by Protestants against such a Supreme, infallible Judge, extant in the Church Catholick, as is pretended in these Discourses.

For the perfect discovery then of the first of these, 1st. If we look back 1. To the Scriptures; and 2. To the Primitive times (to discern if we can from thence, in this present division of Churches, which of them rather have the true notes, and marks of the Church Catholick). We find the Evangelical Church, described in the one, and acting in the other, with very great Authority and most sacred Majesty.

Of his Evangelical Successors, that He left behind him, our Lord pronounceth—*He that heareth you, heareth me*, Luke 10. 16. and—*If any man heareth you not [in matters of controversy brought before you] let him be, as a Heathen, and a Publican*, Mat. 18. 17. Of these he declares—*Qua ligaveritis, & solveritis super terram, erunt ligata &c. & in caelo*, Matt. 18. 18. And—*Quorum peccata solveritis, aut retinueritis, remittentur, &c.* Joh. 20. 23. Of this Church it is said, That it shall be *a City placed on a hill, and a candle put on a Candlestick, and not covered under a Bushel*, Matt. 5. *The pillar of Truth*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. And the foundation of God, which standeth ever sure, 2 Tim. 2. 12. *An uniform Building raised upon its corner stone Christ*, Ephes. 2. 21. And, *a Body, with joints, and ligaments, deriving nourishment one from another, firmly knit together, under its Head, Christ*, Col. 2. 19. *A Government constituted by God, founded, and compassed [in a due subordination] to keep all its members in the unity of Faith, from being*

5. 67. 1. 2.

A Review of the two present opposite Churches, which most resembles the Church Catholick.

1. The face of the ancient Catholick Church.

1. The face of the ancient Catholick Church.

5. 67. 1. 2.

being *assisted* by *angels*, with several *Dollrines*, Eph. 4. 11. 13. 14. 16. And *paritally* to the *worlds*, and, *assisted* with the *Paraclesis* from our *ascended Lord*, to *guide* them into *all truth*, Jo. 14. 16. 26. * which *Governors* who so *resemble*, is in this *reared self* condemned, Tit. 3. 11. Lastly, * S. Peter *entitled* to some *special* *presidence* over this *whole Church* by those *Texts*, — *Tu es Petrus*, & *super hac Petram*, Matt. 16. and — *Regni pro te*, *non deservis habere* : *transfusa frater*, Luk. 12. 32. And — *Pasce ovem tuas* Jo. 21. 16. compared with *Gal. 2. 7*. Where thus S. Paul, — *The Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to me*, as S. Peter (saith he, relating to the *Pasce* in S. John) was *committed* the *Gospel of the Circumcision* : where it is *observable* also, that then, was the *Circumcision* the *whole flock of Christ*, when it was *committed* to *them*. S. Peter's *Commission* over *Christ's sheep* being *ordinary*, given by our *Lord here on Earth*, (which *Peter* also had the *honour* of the *first covering* and *admitting* of the *Gentiles* into this *fold*); S. Paul's *over the Gentiles*, *extraordinary*, given by our *Lord from Heaven*. And this *Commission* of *Magistracy*, given to the *Apostles* by a *supereminent Grace* of *converting Souls*, and of *Miracles*, that was *bestowed* upon him, (*Gal. 2. 8. 9.*) Like to that *more eminently* given to S. Peter, as may be seen in *Act. 9. 40.* and *10. 10.* *Act. 13. 15.* and *19. 13.* and *13. 15.* *Act. 4. 4.* and *10. 13.* compared; And that which is said, *Gal. 2.* *That the Apostles gave the Gospel of the Circumcision committed to Peter*, argues, they *so* is *committed* to *Peter* in some *such* *special* or *supereminent* manner; as not also to all the *rest* of them.

§. 68.

Again; If we look upon the *constitution*, and *temper*, and *manner* of *practices*, of this *Church*, in the *primitive* times.

From the very first we find *teaching* (as Dr. *Field* directed *Arch-Bishop* *Times. 2. 15.*) *Chastising*, *imprisoning*, *in new* *condemning*, *severely* *censuring*, and *delivering* to *Satan*, after *some* *admonition* those that were *hereticon*, and *heretical*. In *matter* of *controversy*, a *Council* called, and the *rule* of it, *from the Spirit* *Sent*, & *not*, and — *Not* *not* *in* *man*. And if we have it be said, that the *Magistracy* *apostles* had *some* *kind* *the* *own*, *yet* we look lower, we find still the *same* *author* *maintained*, and *exercised* by the *Catholic* *Church* of *later* *ages*, especially *by* *that* *of* *the* *16th* *age*, when, flourishing under the *patronage* of the *secular* *power* (now become *Christian*), it *fully* *enjoyed* (as also the *prevalence* in those *times* *parts*) the *free* *exercise* of its *law*, and *discipline*.

§. 69.

I.

In all these times then — We find the *Magistracy* *Church* *Catholic* of those *times* *fully* *joined* with, and adhering

adhering to, that, which was ordinarily stiled *nas' Euxa'* the See Apostolick and S. Peters Chair, and with the Bishop called *his Successor*, as if *Mat. 16. 18.* and *Luke. 22. 29.* were a prophecy thereof: though some other of the greatest Patriarchs stood not so firm, but that the Catholick Church in those days relinquished, and cut them off. In respect of which constant Union of the Catholick Church with the Prime Head thereof it was not unusual in Antiquity to explain *Ecclesia Catholica* by *Ecclesia Romana*, or the Church joyned with the Roman: As also latter times for distinction sake call it *Romana Catholica*. See S. Ambrose *De Obitu Erarii*, relating how his brother Satyrus in *Sardinia*, that was infected with *Luciferianism*—*Advocatus ad se Episcopum, percontaturque ex eo sit, utrumnam cum Episcopis Catholicis, hoc est, cum Romana Ecclesia conveniret.* And S. Cyprian *Epist. 52. ad Antonianum*.—*Scriptisti (saith he) ut exemplum tuarum literarum ad Cornelium Collegam nostrum transmitterem: ut deposita omni sollicitudine jam scires te secum; hoc est, cum Catholica Ecclesia et una unicare.* And Greger. Turonens. *l. 1. c. 25.*—*Romanorum nomine vocantur [i. e. other Sects.] nostra Religionis homines.* We find the same Church, when any opposition o. its Doctrines happened, (as it was, then, exercised with the highest controversies that ever troubled the Church), taking very much authority upon it self; assembling it self in a General Body; making new definitions, as necessity required; anathematizing all dissenters; inserting (as it saw meet, for the more explicate knowledge of them by all its subjects) some of its decisions in the Church's Creeds; which were by it much enlarged, from what they were formerly.

We find it declaring this also in the Creed concerning it self, and enjoining it to be believed by all Christians, that the Catholick Church continues always Holy; Apostolical [preserving their Rules, Traditions, and Doctrines]; and One, [indivisa in se: united in its faith and Communion; and divisa ab omnibus aliis; distinct from all others, whom she declares Heretical, or Schismatical.]

2. Again: we find it, by such definitions put in the Creed, and Belief of them exacted, sufficiently declaring also, that it held it self to be (I say not; proving that it was: againit which only; perhaps misunderstanding his adversary, Dr. Stillingfleet disputes) infallible, or actually unerring in them.

From whence it is thus much is clear; I say, concerning the Catholick Church, and her General Councils of those times; that they held themselves infallible in the things they defined; and, if the testimony, and veracity of the Catholick Church (or her united Gover-

§. 70.
2.

|| P. 558.

nours) in what she then professed, (as of other things, so) of her self, can obtain no belief with some Protestants, either from the witness, that *Church Tradition*, (grounded at first on miracles), or that the *Scriptures*, or some other sufficient evidence in point of reason, which Dr. *Stillingfleet* is contented with, given to it; (of which see below, §. 8, &c.) ; Yet Protestants must grant, that the present Catholic Church (which, or where ever it is) should profess itself infallible, even now only the same error, which the ancient Catholic Church did, before is. And, if here is the thought, that this may qualify some thing concerning the former Church, that by this way it declared not to be self infallible, *verily*, but only, in those things it defined; so I say, neither doth the Church Catholic of this present age profess her self infallible, save in her Definitions: Nor requires she of her definitions any other belief, than the ancient Church did of hers. Nor matters it, whether this certainty of the truth of her definitions arise from the evidence of the former *Revelation*, and *Tradition* of such points defined; or from our *Lords* promise, that in her definitions she shall not err. See before, §. 10. ¶ To proceed.

§. 71.

3.

Tit. 2. 15.

3. We find it, * declaring those *Heresies*, who opposed any of these definitions, and expelling them from the Catholic Communion; most strictly, by *Synodical* and *Communitary* Letters, in preserving, in all points once defined, the *Unity* of the Catholic Faith; and unobscurely separating from any person suspected of any *Heterodoxy*, or division from it. * Proceeding in its censures, not only against some private persons, but against *Churches*, against *Bishops*, against *Patriarchs* themselves; yet these such, as then also failed not to pretend a dutiful continuance in the Faith of former ages; and appealed to the former (short) *Creeds*, and *Confessions* of Faith. Such authority the Church, *Infallible*, or *infallible*, then presumed to use; *cum omni imperio*, and punishing all contempt.

§. 72.

2. *Im. acc. of*
the present
Roman
Church.

If we look, next, on the two present *Bodies*, or combinations of Churches, that flourish at this day in that part of the world, where Christian Religion now (as anciently) enjoys its *freedom*, to see, which of them resembles the constitution, aspect, and manner, of the ancient Catholic Church; we find them of a very different temper, proportion, and pretensions. One of them by much the greater, and, through the Universe most *diffused*, *Body*, and *Communion* that is in *Christianity*; I mean *Rome*, as it is united in the same Government, *Law*, *Faith*, and *Discipline*, with certain subordination of all the Members and Officers

suers thereof under one Ecclesiastical Head. So that if we suppose the Church-Catholick) where are many divided Christian Societies, or confederacies, separated from one another in their Communion, to be but one, (unanimous Body), of them (concerning which see 2 Disc. 1. 26. n. 1. 27. n. 3.); and again suppose the same Church-Catholick to be, for universality, the greatest of those bodies; this must be it. And again, if we suppose a General Council assembled out of all these Societies, its votes would have the pre-eminency over any of the rest, taken apart; and, in any conjunction of them all in such a meeting, it may reasonably be imagined, from the agreement, which the most considerable of the other Churches have with it in most of the Western Confessions, that, in voting them, its party would be increased sooner, than any other.

Again, This great Body also we find hath continued, to this day, united to, and joyned with, the See Apostolick, and Chair of S. Peter, like that Church-Catholick in the Primitive times. And we find it using its authority still after the same manner, as (then) did the true Catholick Church - still, pretending it self (upon our Saviours promises) in its supreme Councils, joyned with the authority of the same Chair, a certain and infallible Guide in the determination of all necessary Faith; to whom all its Subjects owe not only silence, but submission of judgment, and belief. We find it, from time to time (as the ancient Church), when any new Controversies, Opinions, and Sects arise any way dangerous, making new definitions, and more explications of the Catholick Faith; and enlarging from age to age (for which also its adversaries complain of it) the particular, and explicate knowledge, and profession thereof among their Children, as the Heterodox grow more particular and multiplicitous in those errors, that would any way undermine it: as also anciently the Nicene Creed was thought a necessary supply to the Apostolick; and again, the yet larger (Athanasian) a supply to the Nicene, Creed. And these her definitions, now, as then, she passeth under Anathemas to opposers, or dissenters; declares Hereticks, still, (as they were esteemed anciently) such, as oppose them; because these after such decree judged to be (now) wilfully, and contumaciously erring; and declares Schismatics, such as depart, on what cause soever, from her Communion; as vindicating to her self (compounded, in her supreme representative, of all those particular Churches, that remain undivided from S. Peters Chair) the true Title, and right, of the Catholick Church.

Again; upon the same grounds, and as authorized immediately

§. 73.

§. 74.

diately by our Lord, we find her holding her self obliged, and taking upon her, to give, and promulgate her Laws, in matters clearly *Spiritual*, and *Divine*, (secular powers, whether favouring, or frowning), to all her Subjects, however dispersed in several temporal Dominions; presuming still (and thinking, great reason for it) to use as much *Spiritual* authority in their States, when Princes are become Christian and her *Sons*, as all grant her lawfully to have done, when they were yet heathen, and her *Enemies*.

|| *De utilit.*
Credend.
c. 1.

We find her also pressing this obedience to her Decrees on her Children, not * from promising (as S. *Austin* || saith, the Manichees anciently did: which was the occasion of his writing his book *De utilitate Credendi* [*Ecclesia*] before that the things we believe, are proved to us,) evident proofs, or demonstrations (though these are not wanting); but, * from her *authority*, and commission received from our Lord, to decide all controversies, she thinks, necessary; and * from the *traditive* sense of holy Scripture delivered to her from her Fore-fathers. And so also it is, in this Church; that her Subjects, as soon as any thing is cleared to them to be the *Church's* doctrine, dispute it no farther, but presently resign their judgment thereto.

§. 75. 2. 1.

And, as we find it publishing with great authority its Laws to all its Subjects, and Members, wherever residing: So also, by our Lords order (*Mat. 28. 19.*); diligently sending forth its *Missions* into all quarters of the world, among its strangers, and those out of its fold, whether *Infidels* or *Hereticks*, for converting or reducing them to the Christian, and *Catholic* Faith. And to this Body, and that since the time of *Gregory* the First, (when also this Communion was much what the same, as it is now) do most of the *Northern* Nations owe their Conversion to *Christianity*; and at that time our Ancestors, among the rest, under *Ethelbert*, and his Successors, received that *Roman* Profession of Religion, which (900. years after) under *Edward* the Sixth, they cast off. And by the same indefatigable Zeal, Labours, and Sufferings of its *Missioners*, are still those great conversions of Mahometans, and Heathens made both in the *West*, and *East-Indies*, and Southern parts of *Affrick*: (not to insist here on the late reduction of some of the *Christian Sects* also of the Northern and Eastern parts to the Roman Communion.)

|| *Mat. 24.*
14. *Mark*
13. 10.
† *Rom. 1.*

[Where, in calling to mind God's gracious promises, of the Gospel to be preached to all Nations ||; and, the fulness of the Gentiles, to be brought into his Fold † (which we see both he: erefore, and at he present, to be effected solely, or principally by this Body, through great hazards, and much expence of its blood),

I desire

I desire all sober persons to consider; whether the good God, having thus promised to the Nations *Bread*, * would give them, in stead thereof, but a *Stone*? and having promised them the *Revelation* of his Truth; yet * would not send it to them, but abased, and mixed with a manifold *Idolatry* (as Protestants imagine); the worshipping of *dead men*, and of a *bredden* God; and these brought in amongst them by *Antichrist* himself (if the Head of these *Missioners*, the Pope, be so); thus only Satan fighting against Satan; and Popery against Heathenism; * would not, I say, communicate unto them these waters of life to drink of, unless mortified, as it were first with several errors, (as the Protestants say), *gross*, *damnable*, and periculous to their Salvation, and from which the external Communion of all true Believers ought to separate. And again, the end of the world, and, (as the Protestants say), of the reign of Antichrist (whom they count now above 1000. years old, his (ul age being foretold to be 1260.) being now not far off; I desire him (next) to consider; * whether that, which is said to be, in stead of the Roman, the most pure, and Orthodox Religion, (recovered by *Luther*), and to which therefore these *Nations*, (if not already) must be at last converted; whether it, I say, now after a 150. years continuance, hath made any progress suitable to such an effect, as is the reducing of all *Nations* to its *Profession*; or rather, whether, after it had made a sudden increase at first (as new things take most; and Infancy grows fastest), it doth not seem already long ago to be past its full growth, and now rather declining, and withering, and losing ground in many places, where it was formerly well rooted; whilst that *Antichrist*, whom it promiseth to destroy, acquires more strength and daily enlargeth his Dominions; to which I may add; * whether, since Protestantism is divided into so many Sects, severed under so many, differing, secular Heads, the *Nations*, at length converted by them, if they should be brought by some to the *purity*, yet would not still in general want the *Unity*, of the *Christian Faith*. But to return.

All this authority we find one *present body* using now, as the *Catholick Church* did anciently: and among other things, this Body also entitling it self the *present Catholick Church*. So that, if there be a Catholick Church still, which stands invested with that authority, that our Lord bestowed on it; and which the former Church practised; then, seeing that all other Christian societies do renounce and not pretend at all to such an authority; [I mean, the requiring from their Subjects an assent and submission of judgment to their decrees, as infallible in all necessary faith; declaring Hereticks those that oppose their Doctrines, and Schismaticks, that relin-

quish

quish their Communion], and do question this other Church also for using it, it follows, that either this must be the sole Church Catholick that thus bears witness to it self, that it is so; or, that what ever Church besides pretends it self Catholick, doth not exercise, or own, that just power, and those priviledges, with which our Lord hath endowed it.

§. 75. n. 2.

We find further this present Church very vigilant, and zealous in vindicating the honour, and authority, the customs, the decrees of former Church; and pretending, (what ever in truth it doth,) more strictly to follow its footsteps; extolling the Fathers; numbing, allowing, and challenging the Councils, as if it thought them more advantageous for its side; and carrying its self to this old Mother with such expressions of affection, and care of her Reputation, as if it only were her true daughter. Therefore conjoyning the tradition of former Church interpreting Scripture, together with the Text thereof, for the steady guide of its establishing truth, and convincing Heresies: And professing to

|| Concil. Trident. Sess. 18. Salv. Condu.

handle things controverted, || *Secundum sacram Scripturam, Apostolorum traditiones, probata Concilia, Ecclesie Catholica consensus, & sanctorum Patrum auctoritates.*

We find it with the same Zeal, celebrating an honourable Memory of the Fathers, ancient Martyrs, Confessors, and Doctors, in its publick Liturgies; inserting, therein, both their Traditionary Comments on the Text of Scripture, and an abridgement of their holy Lives; there praising God, for their pious Examples, and provoking her present children to an emulation of their virtues, (while another Party, in its pretending a Reformation to the Doctrine and Manners of the Primitive Church; yet, in its new Service, expunged both the Lectons taken out of these Fathers, and the Narrative of their Lives.)

§. 75. n. 3.

|| D. Field p. 188. — Chemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. par. 2. de Canonice missæ.

We find it * retaining the same publick service of the Mass, with the Catholick Church of former ages (as its adversaries confess ||) for this 1000. years (i. e. in the times of St. Gregory), if not without some small additions of something new, yet without change of what was the former: And * much re-

sembling the visage of the ancient Church (especially that after Constantine, when, by the more copious Writings of those flourishing times we come better to discern that Church's complexion) in its Altars, and a quotidian Sacrifice, in its frequency of publick Assemblies and Devotions: solemn observance of Feasts, Vigils, and Fasts: Gravity, and Magnificence of its Ceremonies: In its pretension of Miracles and extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit, in several of its Members: in its high Veneration

Veneration of the Celestial Favourites, who stand in the presence of God, and daily Communication, by Commemorating the Saints departed, with the Church triumphant; and in the honour done to their Holy Relicks; in its charitable Offices performed for those other more imperfect faithful Souls, whose condition in the next world it conceives betterable by its prayers and oblations: In its distinction of sins, and use of its keys toward greater offenders: In retirements from the world, for a nearer converse with God, and the free exercise of Meditation and Devotion: In its variety of Religious Orders, Votaries, and Fraternities: In its advancing the observance of the Evangelical Counsels; its high esteem * of voluntary poverty, (*i. e.* relinquishing all particular property, and enjoying only necessaries in Common); * of virginity and continency; and * of yielding an undisputing obedience (*in limine*) to all the Laws and commands of a Superiour: In the single lives, and sequestration from worldly encombrances, of its Clergy; obliged to a daily task of long Devotions, and purity of conscience, and corporal abstinence, suitable to their attendance on the Altar, and their daily, or very frequently, offering on it the Commemorative Sacrifice of our Lords all-satisfactory Passion, and communicating his most precious Body and Blood: In the like *exercises* to those of all past ages concerning the eminent virtues shining in, and divine favours bestowed on, those holy persons; who have lived in its Communion; their great austerities and mortifications, Ecstasies, Visions, Predictions, Miracles, &c.

[Which stories, if they be all supposed *lies*, and *fictions*, and *hypocrisies*, (as I say, or most of them, for that some counterfeiters will mingle themselves among truth, there is no question), yet such *lies* are also found in all ages, even from the Apostolical Times; nor is the present age more guilty of them, than the precedent (as may be seen by comparing with the modern, the Stories related by S. *Austin*), the Saints lives written by S. *Jerome*, || *De Civit. Gregory Nysien, Theodoret, Socrates, Paulinus, Palladius, Gregory Dei. l. 22.* the Great, Gregory of Tours, Bede, Bonaventure, Bernard, and other ancient Authors;) whilst all other Religions, mean while, have such a disparity to an iniquity, that in them no such things are, at least, feigned.

But indeed, did not many of these Stories contain a certain truth, it cannot be imagined, that so many persons reputed of great Sanctity and Devotion, and several of them contemporary to those whose lives they recorded, should have written them with so full a testimony to many things, not as heard of others, but seen by themselves.] Of the Roman Church and its adherents so persevering in the steps of Antiquity thus

Christians,

Grotius, in the Preface to his *Votum pro Pace*, giving account there of his studies, in reading the Fathers—*Collegi* (saith he) *quod essent illa, quae veterum testimonio, & manentibus in hunc diem vestigiis, semper & ubiq; & perseveranter essent tradita: Videbam ea manere in illa Ecclesia, quae Romana connectitur.*

§. 75. n. 4.

Lately, we find it a Body generally professing against any *Reformation* of the *Doctrines* of the former Church-Catholic; of any age whatsoever; and claiming no privilege of *Infallibility* to it self for the present, which it allows not also to the Church, in all former times. This is the general Character of one *Combination* of the Churches in present being.

§. 76.
3. The face of
the present
Protestant
Churches.

The other present *Combination* of Churches in the *Western* World, we find to be a Body of much different Constitution and Completion.

* Much of its *Doctrin*, *Publick Service*, and *Discipline*, confessed varying from the times immediately preceding: It consisting of those who acknowledge themselves, or their Ancestors, once members of the former, and that have (as they say, upon an *unjust submission* required of them, yet this no more, than their forefathers paid) departed from it; * This new Church only one person at the first; afterward growing to a number; and protected against the *Spiritual*, by a *secular* power: and so we find it subsisting, and acting, at this day, under many several *Secular Heads*, Independent of one another; without whose consent, and approbation first obtained (what if such head should be an Heretick?) It stands obliged, not at any time to make, or promulgate, and enforce upon its *Subjects*, any definitions, or decrees what ever in *Spiritual* matters||.

|| See 25.
Hen. 8. c. 19

As to its *Ecclesiastical Governors*; we find it taking away the higher subordinations therein, that were formerly; and affirming an Independent Coordination, (as to incurring guilt of *Schisma*;) some of all *Primates*; others, of all *Bishops*; very prejudicial to the *Unity* of Faith. We find it standing also disunited from *S. Peters Chair*: yet this a much smaller Body still, than that which is joyned thereto: and therefore in a *General Council*, (supposing all the members thereof to continue in, and to deliver there, their present judgments touching points in dispute) such, as must needs be out-voted by the other; and hence, by the *Laws* of Councils, in duty obliged to submit and conform to it. Neither seems there any relief to this party, to be expected from the accession to their side of any votes from the Churches more remote (I mean the *Greek*, or other *Eastern Churches*), i. we will suppose these also to persist in their present judgment; whose Doctrine, in the chief controversies,

lies, is shew'd || to conspire (yet without any late confederacy) || §. 158. &c. with that of this greater Body, which these reformed Churches have deserted.

We find also this new Combination of Churches, if we may credit that account of it which many of its Writers exhibit, in stead of pretending to assume to it self (Whatsoever *de facto* it doth, of which see more in the following Chap. §. 79. &c.) in its Synods the same authority in stating matters of Faith, which the ancient Councils have used, ¹ zealously contending, that Councils are *fallible* in their determinations, (for so it supports the privilege of using its own judgment against superiour Synods); ² and, accordingly, teaching its Subjects, that it self also is *fallible* in what it proposeth; ³ and engaging them (that they may not be deceived by its authority) upon trial of its Doctrines, and search of the Truth, and examining, with the judgment of discretion, every one for himself, and then relying finally on that sentence, which their own reason gives: ⁴ allowing also their dissent to what it teacheth, till it proves to them its Doctrine out of the *Scripture*; or at least, when ever they are persuaded, that themselves, from thence, can evidence the contrary. Therefore it is also more sparing (or pretends to be so, of which see more below §. 80. &c.) in the articles of its faith, and Religion; especially *positive* ones; many of its Divines holding an union of Faith requisite only in some necessities; and then contracting necessities again in a narrower compass than the Creeds; and because it allows of no judge sufficient to clear what is to be held in controversies ||, therefore holding most controversies in Religion not necessary at all to be determined: and much recommending an Union of Charity there, where cannot be had an Union of Belief. || See Disc. 2. §. 38.

We find them also restraining *Heresy* to points fundamental, and then leaving fundamentals uncertain, and varying, as to several persons; fewer points fundamental to some, more to others; and this no way knowable by the Church. Again, making *Schism* only such a departure from the Church as is *consequence*; and then this thing, *when consequence*, to be judged (for any thing that appears) by those, who depart; by such notions, leaving *Heretics*, and *Schismatics* undiscernable by the Catholick Church, and unseparable from it; and therefore many seeming to understand the *One, Holy, Catholick, Apostolick* Church in the Creed, to signifie nothing else, than the totall complex of all Churches whatever professing Christianity; unless those persons be shut out, who, by imposing some restraint of opinion for others enjoying their Communion, are said to give just cause of a separation.

Accordingly, we find this Body spreading its lap wide to several *Seſſes* (by which it acquires the more conſiderable magnitude ;) and receiving, or *tolerating* in its communion many oppoſite parties of very different Principles ; and hence, as it grows elder, ſo daily branching more and more into diverſity of Opinions, and multiplying into more and more ſubdiviſions of *Seſſes* ; being deſtitute of any cure thereof, both by its neceſſary indulgment of that called *Chriſtian liberty*, and allowance of *private judgment* ; and alſo, by the abſolute *Independence*, one on another, of ſo many ſeveral ſupreme Governours, both the *Secular* and the *Eccleſiaſtical* ; who model and order, diverſly, the ſeveral parts thereof. (As the other Church, in her growing elder, grows more and more particular in her Faith ; and with new definitions, and Canons, fenceth it round about, according as new errors would break in upon it.)

§. 78. n. 1.

|| Soave, p.
642. 344.

Further, we find ſeveral amongſt its Leaders much offended, that *Church-Tradition* ſhould be brought in, together with Scripture, as an authentick witneſs, or Arbitrator, in trying Controverſies. (See the Proteſtants Conditions propoſed to the *Council of Trent* || ; that the *Holy Scripture* might be Judge in the Council, and all humane authority excluded, or admitted with a condition : *Fundantes ſe in S. Scripturis* :) Taking great pains, to * diſcover the errors of the *Fathers*, and their contradicting of one another ; (See *Daille's vray uſage de Peres* ;) and * to ſhew ſeveral of the *works* imputed to them, and admitted by R. Catholicks, *ſuppoſitions*, and *forged* ; (See *Cooks*, and *Perkins*, and *River's* Cenfures) : Taking no leſs pains, to ſhew the non neceſſity of *Councils* in General ; to number the many difficulties, of being aſſured which of them are legal and obliging ; what their Decrees, and what the ſenſe of them ; to diſcover the flaws and deficiencies in moſt of the former *Councils*, (defended by R. Catholicks), as to their calling, or their number, or freedom of Votes, &c. (ſcarce any latter Council remaining unſperſed,) ſo to diſenable their authority from obliging the Church's ſubjects ; and accordingly renouncing the authority of thoſe, which have been held in time of their Anceſtors, ſave only of ſome of the firſt ; contending alſo, corruptions and ſuperſtitious, and Antichriſtianiſm, to have entered into the Church in the very firſt times ; but more eſpecially in the fourth and fifth ages, when the copious Writings, of many Learned Prelates makes more evidently appear the ſenſe of the Church ; yet, eſpecially, the latter Proteſtant Writers, not unuſually, in particular Controverſies diſputed, pleading, theſe *Fathers* and *Antiquity* (the credit whereof in general is ſo much diſparaged),

-disparaged) to go on their side.

Lastly, it seems very much swerved from the pattern of Antiquity in most of those things, wherein the other Body hath been said to resemble it.

Especially in these: The high esteem, frequentation, various uses of the precious Sacrifice of the Altar; frequency of Church Devotions; solemn observance of Feasts and Fasts; The Honour and solemn Commemorations of Glorified Saints and Martyrs; and remembrance at Gods Altar, of the other Faithful deceased; the practice, and recommendation of the three Monastick Vows, and other Counsels of Perfection: The distinction of sins, and painful Discipline of Penitents: and a sovereign and independent Church-Authority, (I mean as to true, unquestionable Spirituals.)

Therefore also, (perhaps, that God might leave to Posterity as it were a standing mark, and fore-warning of the novelty of the Reformed Religion, and spirit,) we find the two first grand Leaders thereof, Luther and Calvin (as if they thought to add the more reputation to their new discoveries of truth, by having no former certain Guides therein, after the Apostles) to have proceeded, at the first, much more unwarily, than some of their Successors have done, in slighting Councils, and undervaluing Antiquity, and freely confessing the ancient, as well as latter, times to be of a different judgment from them. Of which to give you a more clear evidence, I have collected several of their more free expressions, used in those dayes, which if a matter already well known to you you may pass on to §. 78.n.5.

Thus then Luther, concerning the Fathers, in the conclusion of his Book *contra Regem Anglia*—Non ego quero (saith he), quid Ambrosius, Augustinus, Concilia, & usus sanctorum dicunt—Miranda est stultitia Satana, qua iis me impugnat, qua ipse in pugno; & perpetuo Principium petit—Pro libertate ego pugno, Rex pro captivitate pugnat, [Captivitate, in submitting to the Fathers]. In assertionem Articuli—Jam quanti errores in omnium Patrum Scriptis inveniunt? Quoties sibiipsis pugnant? Quis est, qui non sapius Scripturas torserit: And (in the beginning)—Primum scire contestatosq; illos volo; me prorsus nullius, quantum libet Sancti, Patris autoritate cogi velle, nisi quatenus iudicio divina Scriptura [i.e. of his own sense of it] fuerit probata; id, quod scio illos vehementer agere laturos; dicuntq; non esse Scripturas sacras proprio Spiritu interpretandas—And—Cur non liceat hodie, aut saltem aut primum, Sacris litteris studere, sicut licuit primitiva Ecclesia: [as if nothing descended by Tradition].

In his protestation before his Book *de Abrogatione Missa*—Prosestor imprimis (saith he) adversus eos, qui insanis vocibus in me sunt clamaturi; quod

§. 78.n.2.

§. 78.n.3.

contra ritum Ecclesie, contra statuta Patrum, contra probas leges; & receptissimum usum docuerim, harum nihil me audierum. Sciant indocti Pontifices, impii Sacerdotes, Sacrilegi Adonabhi, &c. nos non esse baptizatos, neq; credentes in nomine Augustini, Bernardi, Gregorii, &c. Non audimus; Bernardus sic vixit, & scripsit; sed Bernardus sic vivere, & scribere debuit iuxta scripturas. Concerning the Mass—Ultimo dicta Patrum inducit rex pro Missae Sacrificio, & videt meam stulticiam, quod solus velim sapere per omnes. Hoc est quod dixi; Thomisticos Assinos habere nihil, quod producant, nisi multitudinem hominum, & usum antiquum. And, in superius habylonica, he resolves—Si nihil habetur quod dicatur [i. e. in answer to the Fathers], satius est omnia negasse, quam Missam Sacrificium esse, concedere. And on the same matter, in Missa privata—Hic non moramur (saith he.) si laiciens Papiſte, Ecclesia, Ecclesia, Patres, Patres; quia ut dico hominum dicta, aut facta, nihil in tam magnis causis curamus; Scimus enim ipsos Prophetam lapsum esse, utroq; Apostolos &c. And the Fathers put together, i. e. the Councils, fare no better—Ego doceo (saith

|| Assertion
Art.

he) Concilia dissentire, & resistere, si quando contraria Scriptura [he must mean here, contrary to what he apprehends to be the sense of Scripture] statuerunt. And in his Book de Iudicio Ecclesie de quavis doctrina, he saith—Christus admisit Episcopis Doctrinas, & Concilia cum ius, cum potestatem iudicandi de Doctrina, ac tradidit illa omnibus Christianis in Genere; quoting for it Jo. 10. 4. —Oves mee vocem meam audiunt, alienum autem non sequuntur, sed fugiunt &c. and 1 Thess. 5. Omnia probate. So, contra Regem Anglia, On, —Ascendite a falsis Prophetis Matt. 7. 15. —Hic sola auctoritas (saith he) satis esse queat adversus omnium Scholarum sententias, quae ius iudicandi, & discernendi solis Episcopis, & Administris tribuerunt. And, in the distractions of the new Reformation, some motioning a Synod to be called amongst them, as necessary for settling them, he gives his grave judgment of Synods thus ||—Quamcumque bona existerent, est res mali Exempli; ut probant omnia Ecclesie concilia ab initio [so far, as not to spare that of the Apostolica, Act. 15.]. It aut & in Apostolico concilio ferme de operibus, & Traditionibus, magis quam de fide, sit tractatum; in posteritatem vero nunquam de fide, sed semper de opinionibus, & quasi-superfluis disputationem; ne vili conciliorum nomine pons tam suspectus, & cursum sit, quam nomen liberi Arbitrii. Lastly, the 3d. Canon of the Council of Nice prohibiting the Clergy, ne habere secum [in their houses] mulierem contrarium iustitiae sit moner aut feror,

|| Tom. 2.
p. 24.

|| De concilio
Liii.

aut vici aut curia, aut matercula; he saith ||—Se non intelligere sanctum spiritum de hoc Concilio. And again—An vero nihil aliud est

est ne genti spiritali sancta in concilio, quam ut impossibiliter, periculis, non necessariis, legibus suis ministros obstringas, & amers. I beseech all sober Christians to consider, whether this seems a fit, and well seasoned vessel, for God to infuse into it those new Evangelical Truths, which had been hid to so many former generations: and whether he speaks like a true genuine Son of the ancient Church.

Neither, after him, will he finde *Calvus* of any different temper, who pleaseth, for his satisfaction, to peruse those many places in his *Institutiones*, wherein he so freely censures Antiquity. There || Concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass—*Quis veteres quoque illos* (saith he) *video alio hanc memoriam* [i.e. sacrificii in cruce peracti] *decursum, quam institutioni Domini conveniens* (quod, nescio quam repetita, aut saltem renovata, immolationis faciem eorum causa prae se ferebat) [a thing objected still to the present, as, to the ancient Church,] *Nihil turius piis pectoribus fuerit, quam in pura, simplicique Dei ordinatione acquiescere.*—Again—*Excusari* [veteres] *non posse arbitror, quin aliquid in alienis modo peccaverint: Invenit enim propius Judaicum sacrificandi modum, quam aut ordinaverit Christus, aut Evangelii ratio ferebat.*—In qua merito a eo qui redarguit, quod non contenti simplici & germana Christi institutione ad legis umbras nimis deflexerunt [see much more in *Beza*, *Epist.* 8.]. Concerning the manner of consecration of the Elements, and the reposiſion or reservation of the Sacrament to be ready at any time for communicating the sick, (which, being reserved only in one kind, infers likewise ancient communicating the sick only in one kind)—*Sed enim* (saith he ||) *qui sic faciunt, habent veteris Ecclesiae Exemplum. Faciunt. Verum in re tanta, & in qua non sine magno periculo erratur, nihil turius est, quam ipsam veritatem sequi.* Concerning prayer for the Dead. || *At vetustissima fuit Ecclesiae observatio—Cum mihi objungat adversarii ante mille, & trecentos annos receptum fuisse: Eis rursus intorquo, quo Dei verbo, qua revelatione, quo exemplo, factum est?* Calling there S. *Monica's* request to S. *Austin* ||, to be remembered at the Altar, *avile votum.* Concerning penances and satisfactions, (the imposing a necessity of which penances, by antiquity, upon secret criminous Offenders, infers also a necessity, to such Offenders, of Sacerdotal confession) ||—*Plus aquo certe insistere in his mihi videtur* [vetusti Scriptores]—And—*In exigendis castigationibus fuerunt aliquanto rigidiores, quam ferat Ecclesiastica mansuetudo.*—And ||—*Qua in parte excusari nullo modo potest immadiga veterum austeritas, qua & prorsus a Domini praescripto dissidebat, &c.*—And ||—*Parum me novent, qua in veterum* scriptis

§.78. n.4.

Instit. l.4. c.18. §.11.

l.4. c.17.

§.29.

l.3. c.5.

§.10.

Augustin.

Confes. 9.

c.11.

l.3. c.3.

§.16.

l.4. c.12.

§.8.

l.3. c.4.

§.38.

scriptis de satisfactione passim occurrunt. Video quidem eorum nonnullas, dicim simpliciter, omnes fere, quorum libri exstant, aut hac in parte lapsos esse, aut nimis aspere ac dure locutos. Concerning Monastick Vows, and Life ||—Non dissimulo, vel in illa, quam Augustinus commendat, prisca forma esse nonnihil, quod parum mihi placeat.—Christiana mansuetudinis non est, quasi odio humani Generis, in desertum & solitudinem confugere.—Exemplum inutile, & periculosum, in Ecclesia induxit. Concerning the vow of

|| 7.4. c. 13.
§. 16.

|| 7.4. c. 13.
§. 17.

|| 7.4. c. 12.
§. 27.

|| 1.2. c. 2.
§. 4.

† Resp. ad
Cassian. Offi.
pii viri in
Cass. Oper.
p. 802.

Continency, and Celibacy of the Clergy ||—Faveor antiquitus quicq; receptum fuisse hunc morem; sed eam aetatem sic ab omni vitio liberam fuisse non concedo, ut pro regula habendum sit, quicquid tunc factum est.—And ||—Secuta sunt deinde tempora [i. e. post Nicænam Synodum], quibus invaluit nimis superstitiosa calibatus admiratio.—Hinc illi Canones, quibus primo vetitum est, ne matrimonium contraherent, qui pervenissent ad Sacerdotii gradum: deinde, ne in eum ordinem assun erentur nisi celibes, aut qui thoro conjugali, una cum uxore, renuntiarent. Concerning free will ||—Inter Scriptores Ecclesiasticos [i. e. veteres]—multi longe plus aequo Philosophis accesserunt. And, concerning, the Corruption of humane nature and bondage under sin; 1 Justification gratuita; And 2 Christi Sacerdotall Office, thus he censures Ancient Church-Tradition ||—Verum si quid in controversiam vocetur quia flexibile est 70 81: 10 [the holy Scriptures] instar nasi cerei, si absque Traditionis subsidio, quicquam definire fas non sit, quid jam fiet principis Fidei nostre capitibus? Tria solum exempli causa proferam: 1 Natura nostra corruptio, & misera anima servituti sub peccati Tyrannide, 2 Gratuita justificatio, 3 Et Christi sacerdotium, apud veneratissimos Scriptores ita obscure attingitur, ut nulla inde certitudo possit elici.—Si ex eorum Traditione haurienda sit cognitio salutis nostrae, jacebit omnis fiducia, quia ex illis nunquam discemus, quomodo Deo reconciliemur; quomodo illuminemur a Spiritu sancto, & firmemur in obsequium justitiae; quomodo gratia accepta nobis feratur (Christi obedientia; quid valeat sacrificium mortis ejus, & continuus pro nobis intercessio: quarum rerum luculenta explicatio in scriptura passim occurrit. Itaque (novo hoc Magistro [Cassandro] Authore,) quicunque ad salutem apprime cogniti necessaria sunt, non tantum manebunt semisepulta; sed, quia nulla Traditio suffragatur [i. e. in Antiquity], certitudine carebunt. Thus he, And it is very true, that of such a doctrine, as many Protestants deliver in these matters, no footsteps will be found in antiquity; and that nulla Traditio suffragabitur. Concerning authority of Councils ||—Quoties alicujus Concilii decretum proferitur—velim illud ipsum de quo agitur ad Scripturam amissim examinari,—And ||—Nulla conciliorum, Pas-

|| 7.4. c. 9.
§. 8.

|| §. 12.

torum, Episcoporum nomina (qua tam falsi, obtendi, quam usurpari possunt) nos impediunt; quo minus, & verborum, & rerum documentis moniti, omnes omnium spiritus, ad divini verbi regulam, exigamus [i. e. ones own interpretation of it.] — And || — *In recentioribus Conciliis, cum numerantur, non appenduntur sententia, meliorem partem a majore vinci sapius necesse fuit.* Much more might be added out of these two, the most famed, Reformers: And he that would look further, let him pass on to the Centurists, viewing their then free and candid Confessions, concerning the Lapses of the fourth age (i. e. the first, wherein Christian Religion flourished and shewed her face more openly,) and so downward, as if they added so much more credit to the *Reformation*, by how much more ancient they shewed those errours or corruptions to have been, which it encountered and overthrew. But this I have here set down, I think, is sufficient, that by the complexion and temper of these two chief Authors of the *Reformation* you may discern what blood runneth in the veins of their posterity, whatever Alliance to antiquity is professed: and may see, whether their followers in the same Doctrine, can any way justly own that antiquity for it, that these predecessors disclaimed. □

This appears to me much-what the face of the *two present Churches*; the *latter* of which, because I may be thought not to have drawn favourably enough, or yet some lines thereof, not according to truth, if they be applyed to some persons, that are more *moderate*; or some Church, among them, that is of a *better constitution*: I desire none to give any credit to any part thereof further, than his own experience shall find it true: and to look upon what is said, as things proposed only to his search, not imposed on his credulity. After which search diligently made (as it much concerns him), let him again review and compare, which of these two, in its constitution and Oeconomy, hath more resemblance of that Church described in the New Testament; and acting in the Primitive times, (mentioned before, §. 67. 68.): and then, that of the two, which, by its greater likeness in Government and manners to this ancient Church, he takes to be his *Catholic Mother*, let him (especially if unlearned) securely cast himself into her arms, and communion: and instead of committing himself to his own understanding and industry, to find out his own way to Heaven, (because he can securely trust no living guide on Earth besides), through all the thorny controversies of the present age, grown (as Dr. Field saith) in number so many, and in matter so intricate; which require vast pains through-ly,

thoroughly to examine; and an excellent judgment aright to determine; and which much eloquence, and long smoothing of them, the interposing of humane reason in divine matters, and the varying records of former ages, have rendred on all sides so far plausible, and resembling truth, that a little interest serves the turn to blind a man in his choice, and make him embrace an error for truth; let him I say humbly resigne his wearied, and distracted judgment wholly to her direction.

§. 78. n. 6.
|| p. 29.

For (as Sir Edwyn Sandys in his *Relation of the Western Religions* || speaks methinks very pertinently, though in the person of a *Romanist*, pleading his own cause) — *Seeing Christianity is a Doctrine of Faith, a Doctrine, whereof all men even children are capable, as being gross and to be believed in general [by all] : Seeing the high verine of Faith is in the humility of the understanding ; and the merit thereof, in the readiness of Obedience to embrace it : and seeing the outward proofs thereof are no other than probable, and of all probable proofs the Church-testimony is most probable [So he : which I propose rather thus . Seeing of outward proofs of our Faith, where the true sense of Scripture is the thing disputed, the Church's testimony, (whether for declaring to us the sense of Scripture, or judgment of the Ancients), is a proof of most weight] ; What madness were it for any man to tire out his soul, and to waste away his spirits, in tracing out all the thorny paths of the controversies of these days, wherein to err is no less easy, than dangerous, what through forgery [of authors] abusing him, what through sophistry transporting him, and not rather to betake himself to the right path of truth, whereunto God, and nature, reason and experience, do all give witness ? and that is, to asscise himself to that Church, whereunto the custody of this heavenly, and supernatural truth hath been from heaven itself, committed : to weigh discreetly which is the true Church, and, that being once found, to receive faithfully, and obediently, without doubt, or d scission, whatsoever is delivereth ?*

§. 78. n. 7.

|| p. 30.

And then further : If, in this distinction of his (to make use here of that plea, which the same Author, in the following words, hath very fairly drawn up || for the Church of Rome, and her adherents, without giving us any counter-defence, or shewing any more powerful attractives than these of the Churches reformed ; what ever he intended) — *If [besides the Roman, and these Churches mixed with it] he finds all other Churches have had their end, or decay long since, [I mean the Sects, and Religions, that have been formerly in the Western World Hussites, Lollards, Waldenses, Albigenses, Berengarians, which Sects some Protestants make much pretence to], or their beginning but of late : if This being founded*

founded by the Prince of the Apostles, with promise to him by Christ, that Hell gates should not prevail against it, but that himself will be assistant to it till the Consummation of the World, hath continued on now till the end of a 1600. years, with an honourable and certain line of near 240. Popes Successors of St. Peter; both tyrants and tyrants, pagans, and hereticks, in vain wrestling, raging, and undermining. If all the lawful General Councils, that ever were in the world, have from time to time approved, and honoured it; if God hath so miraculously blessed it from above, as that so many sage Doctors should enrich it with their writings; such armies of Saints with their holiness, of Martyrs with their Blood; of Virgins with their purity; should sanctifie and embellish it: If even at this day, in such difficulties of unjust rebellions, and unnatural revolts of her nearest children, yet she stretcheth out her arms to the utmost corners of the world, newly embracing whole Nations into her bosome. If lastly, in all other opposite Churches, there be found inward dissensions, and contrariety, change of opinions, uncertainty of resolutions, with robbing of Churches, rebelling against governours [things much more experienced since this authors death in the late Presbyterian wars] confusion of order [invading of Episcopacy, and Presbytery too] where as contrariwise, in this Church, the unity undivided, the resolutions unalterable, the most heavenly order reaching from the height of all power to the lowest of all subjection, all with admirable harmony, and undefectivè correspondence, bending the same way to the effecting of the same work, do promise no other than continual increase, and victory: let no man doubt to submit himself to this glorious spouse of God &c. This then being accorded to be the true Church of God, it fell out, that she be reverently obeyed in all things without further inquisition; she having the warrant, that he that heareth her, heareth Christ; and whosoever beareth her not, hath no better place with God, than a publican, or a pagan. And what folly were it to receive the Scriptures upon credit of her authority [the authority of the Church, that was before Luthers times]; and not to receive the interpretation of them upon her authority also and credit? And if God should not alway protect his Church from error [i. e. dangerous to, or destructive of, Salvation] and yet peremptorily commanded men alway to obey her then had he made but very slender provision for the salvation of Mankind; which conceits concerning God (whose care of us even in all things touching this transitory life, is so plain, and evident), were ungrateful, and impious. And hard were the case, and mean had his regard been, of the vulgar people, whose wants, and difficulties in this life will not permit, whose capacity will not suffice, to sound the deep, and hidden mysteries of Divinity, and to search out the truth

of intricate Conclusions, if there were not others, whose authority they might [safely] rely on. Blessed are they, who believe, and have not seen, [Though they do not see reason always for that they believe, have only that reason of their Belief drawn from Authority] the merits of whose Religious humility and obedience, both exceed perhaps, in honour, and acceptation before God, the subtil, and profound knowledge of many others. Thus that Author pleads the cause of the Roman, and adherent, Churches, without a Reply.

§. 78. n. 8.

|| D. Taylor
Liberty of
prophecyng.
§. 20. p. 249.

To which perhaps it will not be amiss to joyn the like Plea, for the same Church, drawn up by another eminent Person among Protestants, in a treatise writ concerning the unreasonableness of prescribing to other mens Faith; wherein he endeavour'd to represent several Sects of Christianity in their fairest colours, in order to a charitable toleration: These considerations, then he there proposeth concerning the Roman Church (Which faith he may very easily persuade persons of much reason, and more piety, to restrain that, which they know to have been the Religion of their Fore-fathers; which had actual possession, and seizure of mens understandings, before the opposite profession had a name). These are, first, Its Doctrine's having had a long continuance, and possession of the Church, which therefore cannot easily be supposed, in the present Professors, to be a design, [for covetous, ambitious, and other unlawful ends, of which yet Protestants frequently accuse them] since they have received it from so many ages; and it is not likely, that all ages should have the same purposes, or that the same Doctrine should serve several ends of divers ages. Its long prescription, which is such a privilege, as cannot with many arguments be retrench'd; as relying upon these grounds; that truth is more ancient than falsehood; that God would not, for so many ages, forsake his Church, and leave her in an error. I add, nor in such gross errors as are imputed; especially, not in Idolatry, so manifold; in respect of the Eucharist; of the Cross; of Angels and Saints; of Relicks; of Images, &c.] Again, The beauty, and splendour of that Church; their pompous service, in a splendid expression, their service, full of religious Ceremony, and external Veneration. The stateliness and solemnity of the Hierarchy; their name of Catholick, which they suppose, and claim, as their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Christians, [that are Hereticall and Schismaticall]. The Antiquity of many of their Doctrine's; the continual succession of their Bishops; their pretended derivation from the Apostles; their title so succeed St. Peter [and in this regard, chiefly honoured, and subordinated to

by,

by Antiquity] : the supposals, and practices of his personal privi-
leges [much spoken of by the Fathers] the flattering expressions of
minor Bishops [in modest language, the honourable expressions
concerning this Church from many eminent Bishops of other infe-
rior Sees] which, by being old Records, have obtained Creditability.
The multitude and variety of people, which are of their persuasion ;
apparent consent with some elder Ages, in many matters doctrinal ;
the advantage which is derived to them by entertaining some personal
opinions of Fathers, which they with infinite clamours cry up to be a do-
ctrine of the Church of that time ; [or trulier thus : entertaining the
Doctrine of the Church of the ancient times, which Protestants cry
down as only the personal opinions of some Fathers] . The great
consent of the one part with another, in that which most of them
affirm to be de fide ; the great differences which are commenced among
their adversaries, abusing the liberty of prophesying, unto a very great
licentiousness ; their happiness of being instruments in converting di-
verse Nations ; the advantage of Monarchical Government the benefi-
t of which they daily do enjoy ; the piety, and the austerity of their Reli-
gious Orders of men, and women ; the single life of their Priests, and
Bishops ; the Riches of their Church ; the severity of their fasts, and
their exterior observances ; the great Reputation of their Bishops for
Faith, and Sanctity ; the known holiness of some of those persons, whose
Institutes the Religious persons pretend to imitate ; their Miracles,
false, or true, substantial, or imaginary [or trulier, several of
which (though none affirms all, or perhaps the most of those pre-
tended) are confirmed by such clear Testimonies, as if any Faith
may be had to any humane Testimony, or to any History, they
cannot be false, or imaginary,] . The casualties, and accidents,
that have hapned to their adversaries ; the oblique acts, and indirect
proceedings of some of those, who departed from them ; and, among
many other things, the name of Heretick, and Schismatick ; which
they, with infinite pertinacy, fasten upon all, that disagree from them.
[or trulier, which this Church, with a venerable, and mater-
nal authority, and correction, (as the Catholick Church in all
ages hath done, and none other Church in this age, except this,
presumeth to do) pronounceth on all others, who depart from her
Faith, or Communion as such ; in former ages, the same names
have been fastned on all those, who have so departed. On Beren-
garius, Wickliff, Walloweser, &c.]

These Persuasives Dr. Taylor hath there collected, as in-
cluding persons of much reason, and more piety, to retain the Religion of
their Forefathers. Now let any, if they can, gather out of him,
the counter-persuasives, that over-possesse these, and may induce

persons of much reason, and equal piety, to renounce the Religion of their Fore-fathers, and hearkning to some Negative Arguments, from Scripture or (for some points) perhaps also from the Writers of the three first ages, commit themselves to the conduct of the New Reformers ; at the first, a few ; of the lowest rank of Clergy ; lying under the Ecclesiastical censures ; assisted against their spiritual Superiours by some secular powers ; when both they, and these were Subjects, as to the judgment of all spiritual matters, to that Ecclesiastical Hierarchy which they opposed.

§. 78. n. 9.

Now, to confirm what hath been said above ; In the last place, I will set you down some passages of *St. Austin*, representing the Catholick Church, ' as an united and distinct body ; ' easily discernable from Sects ; ' and, where Scriptures are controverted, to be obeyed and adhered to ; ' though this, not always for any other present reason, or proof given us of what he holds, save only that of her Authority ; which passages of this, the most eminent Father of the Church, I also seriously recommend to his Meditation, who is in an humble quest after this Guide.

¶ De Baptismo.

l. 1. c. 10.

† Cap. 10.

¶ Cantic. 6. c.

¶ De Baptismo.

l. 1. c. 11.

1st. Concerning the Catholick Church : That it, where any division is made from Superiours (as was made by the Donatists from a General Council) is only one of these Churches, and not both ; *St. Austin* || mentions this proposition as agreed on, both by the Donatists, and Catholicks. — *Unam oportet esse Ecclesiam* †

— And — *Una est Ecclesia quaecunque illa sit, de qua dictum est* ||

— *Una est columba mea, una est mater mea ; nec possunt tot esse Ecclesiae, quot Schismata.* || — And so he allows the Donatists arguing ;

— *Si nostra est Ecclesia Christi, non est Ecclesia Christi vestra Communio.* This Tenent of theirs he passeth for truth ; and only opposeth this other ; that theirs, and not that from which they separated, was it ; and there proveth the contrary, viz. That the Anti-Donatist was that, *una Ecclesia, qua sola Catholica nominatur* ; and that the Donatist was *Communio a sua unitate separata* ||

¶ Ibid. c. 10.

§. 78. n. 10.

¶ Cap. 15.

2^d. Again, Concerning this one Catholick Church, that it is easie to be known, and discerned from others, he saith in his book *De unitate Ecclesiae* against the same Donatists || — *Non est obscura questio, in qua nos fallant, quas ipse Dominus prae dixit futuros a quo dicturos ; Ecce hic est Christus, ecce illic, ecce in deserto, quasi ubi non est frequentia multitudinis ; ecce in cubiculis, quasi in seorsis traditionibus, atque doctrinis. Habemus Ecclesiam ubique diffundi, & crescere usque*

usque ad messem; *Habetis Civitatem, de qua ipse, qui eam coëdidit, ait; n: n: potest Civitas abscondi super montem posita. Ipsa est ergo, que non in aliqua parte terrarum, sed ubiq; notissima est.* And—*Contr. Cresconium, l. 1. c. 33.* He iterates the iame —*Si autem dubitas, quod Ecclesiam, que per omnes gentes numerositate copiosissima dilatur, hec S. Scriptura commendat, multis & manifestissimis testimoniis ex eadem autoritate [the Scriptures] prolatis onerabo.* [where he that will say, this *Father* speaks of the Church *Catholic* only as it was in *h's*, not as it is to be in *all*, times; must also interpret those *Scriptures*, from which he proves it, to speak of *h's*, or some times only, not of *all*; which is absurd, and would have voided *S. Austin's* arguing, used again't the *Donatists* then, (as well as it will any others, now :) who might have replied to him; that these *Texts* were verified of *some*, but not of *their*, times. And indeed they did urge, that *S. Austins* sense of them, in application to the Church, failed in the *Arrian* times; and upon this see (in his 48. *Epistle*) his vindicating them to be verified of it in all times. And it seems all reason, that, in the Scripture's describing that Church, to whose bosome and Communion all people were, for ever, to resort, the Marks to know it by should be Universal; and no more demonstrate to Christians the Church of one age, than of another; no more that in *S. Austins* times, than that in *ours*; to whose Faith and Communion Christians have in *all* times, a like duty to conform; and whose judgment, a like necessity, to consult. Though it is willingly granted, that such Properties admit of several degrees; nor is it necessary either for its multitude, extent, or emiency, that the Church should alway enjoy them in an equal proportion.

3ly. Concerning our duty of crediting, and adhering to the Church's testimony, and judgment in matters controverted, and obscure, he thus discourseth || against the *Donatists*; who pleaded, nothing in *Scriptures* could be shewed clear again't them. — *Proinde, quamvis huius rei certe de Scripturis Canonis non proferatur exemplum, earundem tamen Scripturarum, etiam in hac re, a nobis tenetur veritas, cum hoc facimus, quod universa placuit Ecclesie, quam ipsarum Scripturarum commendat autoritas; ut, quoniam Sancta Scriptura fallere non potest, quisquis falli metuit, huius obscuritate quæstioni, eandem Ecclesiam de illa consulat, quam sine ulla ambiguitate Sancta Scriptura demonstrat. [i. e. as infallible; otherwise the falli metuit is not remedied by the Church demonstrated.]*

Again: *De Unitate Ecclesie, c. 22.* Hoc (saith he) aperte, atq; evidenter [(i. e.) in the Scripture], nec ego lego, nec tu. Nunc vero, cum in Scripturis non inveniamus &c. pmo, si aliquis sapiens

§.78. n. 31.

1 *Contr. Cresconium, l. 1. c. 33.*

sapiens extitisset, cui Dominus Jesus Christus testimonium perhibet [that we should be directed by his judgment], Et de hac quaestione consuleretur a nobis, nulla modo dubitare deberemus id facere, quod ille dixisset; ne non tam ipsi, quam Domino Jesu Christo, cujus testimonia commendatur, repugnare judicaremur: Perhibet autem testimonium Christus Ecclesia sua. [i. e. ut non dubitemus facere, quod illa dixerit].

§. 78. n. 12.

|| cap. 13.

|| Retraët.

I. I. c. 14.

4. Lastly, Concerning the benefit in adhering to, and relying on the Church's authority, or testimony, before that proved to us which she delivers to us, he discourseth thus, in his Book *De utilitate Credendi* [i. e. *credendi Ecclesie*] written, not long after his Conversion, to a former acquaintance—*qui irridebat* (as he saith) Catholicæ fidei disciplinam, qua jubermur credere hominibus; non autem, quid esset verum, certissima ratione doceremur. Recte (saith he) Catholicæ disciplina maiestate institutum est, ut accedantibus ad Religionem fides [i. e. adhibenda auctoritati ecclesiæ] persuaideatur ante omnia—And, c. 10. Sed, inquis, nonne erat melius, rationem mihi reddere, ut, quocumque ea me doceret, sine ulla sequeretur temeritate? Erat fortasse, sed cum res tanta sit, ut Deus tibi ratione cognoscendus sit, vixisse putas idoneos esse percipiendis rationibus, quibus, ad divinam intelligentiam, mens ducitur humana? an plures, an paucos? paucos, aut, existimo. Quid? cæteris ergo hominibus, qui ingenio tam sereno præditi non sunt, negandam Religionem putas? [If not; such must receive this their Religion not from Reasons, but Authority.] And, c. 16. Auctoritate accipi miserum est; miserius non moveri. Si Dei providentia non præficeret rebus humanis, nihil est de Religionem satagendum. Non est desperandum, ab eodem ipso Deo auctoritatem aliquam constitutam, quam velut gradu certo, insidentes, attollamur in Deum. Hæc autem auctoritas, seposita ratione (quam sanctam intelligere, ut diximus, difficillimum stultis est) dupliciter nos movet, partim miraculis; partim frequentium multitudine. And c. 8. He thus exhorts his sceptical Friend Honoratus seduced by the *Manicheans*. Si jam satis jactatus videris, sequere viam Catholicæ Disciplinæ, quæ ab ipso Christo per Apostolos ad nos usque mansit, & adhuc ad posteros manitura est. Those, who can humble their reason so far, as to embrace this holy Comfort, through the abundant providence of God without no great difficulty in discerning their right Guide, and chasing the true Religion.

—at the end of the chapter, the words are (c. 14.) CHAP. 14. THE END OF THE FIRST BOOK OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF THE ROMANS.

CHAP. VII.

Whether the Church of England doth not require assent to her Articles of Religion.

Several Canons in her Synods seeming to require it. §. 83. n. 1.

The complaint of the Presbyterians, concerning it. §. 83. n. 4.

The Definition of her Divines. §. 84. n. 1.

Where, concerning the just importance of Negative Articles. §. 84. n. 1. and 85. n. 2.

and concerning Conditional Assent. §. 84. n. 4. and 85. n. 10.

That to some of the 39 Articles Assent is due, and ought to be required. §. 85. n. 1.

That the Roman Church doth not require assent to all the Canons of her Councils, as it points Fundamental; i. e. of any of which Points a Christian resolute cannot be saved. §. 85. n. 4.

That obedience either of assent or non-contradiction, if required by the Church of England to all the 39. Articles, seems contrary to the Laws of the Church; and to the Protestant Principles. §. 85. n. 11.

After this view of the Two present opposit Churches, which of them more resembles the Ancient Catholic; the latter whereof, the Protestant Churches seem to build the defence of the Reformation, and the Vindication of their liberty from former Church-laws, upon the denial of any such obedience of assent, or belief due to the former Church, and her Councils, as was exacted by them (of which matter see what is said before §. 39. &c.): I think fit, before I proceed to the 2d. thing proposed before, §. 87. The Consent of the Eastern Churches with the Roman, to search here, first, more particularly: whether this liberty which Protestants claim in respect of any authority superior, the Councils, and former Church; yet be not denied by them to their Subjects; at least by the Church of England, if we may inform our selves out of the most obvious sense of several of those Canons, made in the late National Synods thereof.

That (then) the National Synods of the Church of England, notwithstanding their heavy accusations of the Council of Trent for the like practices do exact the Obedience of Assent to their Decrees; and that under pain of Excommunication; or, of such person's being cut off from the Unity of the Church (and so, if the Excom-

§. 79. n. 1.

|| Art. of
Church of
England. 33

Excommunication be just, of such person, if impenitent, being cut off from the Body of Christ, and being taken of the whole multitude of the Faithful as an *Heathen and Publican* ||). See 1st. the Synod held under K. James 1603. The 4th. Canon whereof runs thus, *Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm, that the form of Gods Worſhip eſtabliſhed by Law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer containeth any thing in it, that is repugnant to the Scriptures, let him be Excommunicated ipſo facto, and not reſtored, but after his Repentance, and publick Revocation of ſuch his wicked Errors.*—

Again, thus Can. 5. — *Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm, that any of the 39. Articles agreed upon by the whole Clergy in the Convocation held 1562. for the avoiding diverſities of opinions, and for the eſtabliſhing of conſent, touching true Religion, are in any part erroneous; or ſuch, as he may not with a good Conſcience ſubſcribe unto, let him be Excommunicated ipſo facto, and not reſtored, but after his Repentance, and publick revocation of ſuch his wicked errors.*

To which may be added * the title prefixed to the 39 Articles, which ſaith; *that theſe Articles were drawn up for the avoiding diverſities of opinions, and for the eſtabliſhing of conſent touching true Religion.* And * thoſe words, in the preface to the ſame Articles, *Requiring all the Subjects of this Church to continue in the uniform profeſſion thereof, and prohibiting the laſt difference from the ſaid Articles.*

Here then 1st. the Church of England, in the Title, and in the 5th Canon, declares, that theſe Articles were drawn up for the avoiding of *diverſities of opinions*, and for the *eſtabliſhing of Conſent*. But how, doth the drawing-up, or alſo the impoſing, of theſe Articles, effect the *avoiding diverſities of opinions*, if the Church by this act layes no reſtraint at all upon opinions, nor the Subscription required to them imply any aſſent to, or belief of them? or how effect the *eſtabliſhing of conſent*, if all the obedience the Church requires to them be only a *non-contradiction*?

2. Again; here (in the Preface to the Articles) not only ſilence, and non-renouncing, but *profeſſing*, of them is required; but none are tied to profeſs any thing, but what they alſo are tied either to believe or to profeſs; though againſt their Conſcience, the latter of which muſt not be ſaid.

3. Again, in the 5th Canon, the words — *Erroneous, or ſuch as he may not with a good Conſcience ſubſcribe*; do imply, that he cannot with a good Conſcience ſubſcribe to them, who thinks them erroneous; but any may ſubſcribe to them with a good conſcience, though they be erroneous, if the ſubſcription only oblige to *non-contradiction*; for none are bound in conſcience to contradict every thing,

thing, that they hold an Error, *and* here [in the 4th and 5th Canon] the Church of England Excommunicates them, that affirm such, and such things not, till they repent of, and publickly revoke their unpeacefull, or turbulent contradiction of her decree; but till they repent of, and revoke, their wicked errors: and see Can. 12. revoke their Anabaptistical errors; where [Anabaptistical joyned to Error] clearly applies the word [Error] not to the act of contradicting, but to the matter, wherein such a one contradicts. Now Excommunication here, till one revokes his Errors, is till one changeth, or at least professeth, that he changeth, his opinion; for one may revoke, or Repent of his Contradiction, who doth not at all of his Errors; which contradiction is not an Error of the understanding, but a fault of manners; which also we easily rectifie, without repenting of or revoking any former opinion, and consequently without revoking our Error. But here the Excommunication extends to this latter. Where if, by any ones publickly revoking his wicked Errors, bemean only the revoking of the divulging of his wicked Error, then would such a recantation as this, be sufficient to restore such an excommunicated person to the Church's Communion; I bold indeed my former tenent still, but heartily repent, and am sorry, that I have divulged it; nor will I, for the future, do the like. But such reconciliative recantations we know are never accepted amongst the Reformed, unless such persons condemn also their former Doctrine as false, and acknowledge for true, and Orthodox those of the Church? Again? In this matter I ask; If any one, when required by the Church to declare his opinion, doth affirm such a wicked Error, to the affirmers whereof the Church hath denounced Excommunication (for Example, affirms the King not to be Supreme in Ecclesiastical matters, against the 24. Canon) whether is he not, in such a case, liable to Excommunication? If he be, then it is not because he declareth what he holdeth (for, how can the Church excommunicate him for doing that, which she requireth of him; i. e. for declaring what he holdeth, upon her interrogation)? but, because he holdeth that which he ought not, (7. 8.) for his opinion, of his wicked Error, as the other said, And does not the Church of England likewise allow of the Kings requiring, in the Oath of Supremacy, touching this point, not only a non-affirmation of the contrary, or a non-contradicting of such a truth; but a sincere acknowledgmen in his conscience, and a believing of it. I da hereby testify and declare in my conscience &c.

H h

one, that hath an Ecclesiastical living, declare his assent, and subscribe to the 39. Articles of Religion. And that no person be admitted to any Benefice with cure, except he shall first have subscribed the same Articles, with declaration of his unfeigned assent to the same.

[Here you see the subscription interpreted assent.] Now will the Church deny the lawfulness of the Act of the State, passed by the Lords, Spiritual as well as Temporal: Or, may not a Church, though fallible, enjoy, or require as much acknowledgement, as much assent in a matter of Faith, as the said Church allows a fallible King, or Parliament, to do?

But see Canon 36. Of the same Synod, 1603. where the Church also requires the Subscribers, not only, not to affirm the 3. Articles, contained in that Canon, to be erroneous, Namely, *That the Kings Majesty, is the only Supreme Governour of his Realm in spiritual things.*

2. *That the Book of Common prayer containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, &c.* But in the third Article, (more expressly) requires him to subscribe *That he alloweth, and acknowledgeth, [i.e.] confesseth, believeth.] all the 39. Articles to be agreeable to the Word of God.*

Add to this, *That* under the Canon 140. excommunicates, (till they publicly revoke their wicked error) any, who shall affirm, that they, who had not given their voices to the decrees made in the Second Synod of this Nation, are not subject to the decrees thereof; and therefore, in the conference at Hampton Court, the Puritan Party moved this question: *how far such Ordinances of the Church were to bind them, without impeaching their Christian liberty?* They received from the King this answer: *I will have one Doctrine, and Discipline, one Religion in Substance, and Ceremony, and therefore charge you never to speak more to that point; How far you are bound to obey, Where the Church hath ordained it.* This injunction of King James to Puritans, had it been obeyed by the first Reformation, &c. that they should not question how far they were bound to obey what the Church for preserving unity in Doctrine or Discipline, had ordained, would it not have prevented the birth of Protestantism, and the dispute at Hampton Court? And so

§. 79. n. 2.

to 1. Against the Church of England; in some of those Canons, excommunicates members of it doing that thing, which the commandment of God doth not forbid; but this is not a prohibition of Practicals, there is involved in some Christian duties, that such Practices are lawful. See the sixth Canon, which commands, *that no person shall hereafter* [i.e.] *from any time forth* *be admitted to the Communion, but such as shall have subscribed the same Articles, &c.* and the seventh Canon, which commands, *that no person shall be admitted to the*

strian Profession; let them be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored; till after their repentance, and publick Reconciliation, of such their wicked errors.

Here the Church of England requires under pain of Excommunication, that none do account her Communion profane, &c. For whosoever accounteth the Church of England such, (her self being Judge), ought to separate from her, an erroneous conscience obliging. Neither may any say, that the Church here, for his restitution, enjoins repentance, only for his separating, but rather, for his accounting those, who conform, profane, i. e. for his errors, from which her profaneness once granted a separation ought to follow.

Again, Canon 12. Those, who submit themselves to be ruled by any Ecclesiastical constitutions, made without the Kings authority, are excommunicated. Here the Canon requiring men not to submit to be governed by such constitutions, requires them to believe also such Ecclesiastical Constitutions to be unlawfully made, and not obliging them to submit; else men ought to submit unto them.

Canon 59. These Persons, who do not teach on Sundays the Catechism, set forth in the Common Prayer Book, are excommunicated: But, if they hold any thing in such Catechism unlawful, they may not teach it; therefore the Synod, in expressly requiring them, under pain of Excommunication, to teach it, virtually, under the same penalty, requires their assent, that it is lawfully to be taught.

2ly. In the National Synod, held under King Charles 1640. See the 3d Canon; where it is ordered, — That all Popish Recusants [though silent, though nothing affirming, whatever way they can be discovered, whether by their refusing to take the Oath of Allegiance, (which Oath exacts their punctual assent to several Doctrines,) ; or by their refusing to receive the Communion with the Members of the Church of England (a practice that requires their assent, that this Church is not Schismatical)], be excommunicated. Where, whilst the Church of England thinks, she hath sufficient authority to exclude from her Communion all that hold the Popish Tenets, why complains she of the tyranny of the Roman Church in excluding from her Communion all, that hold the Protestant Tenets;

Again, in the fourth Canon it is decreed, — That any one, who is accused of Socinianism, unless he will absolutely & in terminis, abjure it, be excommunicated. Now he that is required, upon pain of Excommunication, to abjure the Popish, or the Socinian Tenets, is required under the same penalty, to assent to

the *Protestant*, or the *Anti-Sacrian*, Tenents, whereever these are immediately contrary, or contradictory to the other, as many times they are. So whoever is obliged to abjure, *Filium non esse Consubstantialem Patri*, is obliged by the same Canon to assent *Filium esse Consubstantialem Patri*.

Lastly, in the sixth Canon there the Synod requires* assent to, and approbation of the Doctrine, and Discipline of the Church of England as containing all things necessary to Salvation; and * the Profession of this assent upon Oath. I A. B. do swear, that I do approve, and sincerely acknowledge the Doctrine [i. e. expressed in the 39. Articles], and Discipline established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to Salvation [that is, I do assent, and believe it to contain, &c.]

Thus much of several Injunctions, and Canons of the Reformed Synods of the Church of England, which seem to tie her Subjects to as strict an Obedience of assent, and approbation (for any thing I can discern) to all her Doctrine, and discipline, as any other Councils have done; and to give as little liberty to any to oppose her decrees (notwithstanding what she saith of the Church, and of Councils, Art. 20. & 21.)

§. 79. n. 4.

[Hence that complaint of the Presbyterian Ministers, concerning their obligation to these Articles and Canons, in their *Reasons, shewing necessity of Reformation*, printed 1660. and presented to the Parliament, p. 5. — * That, if they might not subscribe with such an addition [so far forth, as the same Articles are agreeable to Gods Word], it must needs be granted, that the composers of them are admitted to be infallible; or else, that the Statute 13. Elizabeth 12. intendeth to tyrannize over the Consciences of men [i. e. requiring them to profess what their conscience tells them, is not truth]. — * That the Statute requireth Belief of every one of these Articles, when it enjoyns, not only subscription, but an assent unto them; punishing all with deprivation, that shall affirm and maintain any Doctrine repugnant to them; which every man must do, if they be found contrariant to the Word, or he must be false to God. — And p. 36. Concerning obligation to Ceremonies; * That these ought not to be imposed on those who cannot be fully persuaded in their own minds, and consciences, that they are lawful; and therefore must sin, if they use them. Thus the Presbyterians,

Yet this course, as most necessary, was long ago hinted by *Calvin*, to the first Founder of the English Reformation, the Lord Protector, in the days of Edward the Sixth. — *Expediet quidem* (saith he) *prospicere de falsariis Ingeniis, qua sibi nimium licere volunt; claudenda est etiam janua curiosis doctrinis. Ratio autem*

autem expedita ad eam rem una est; Si exister nempe summa quadam doctrinæ ab omnibus recepta, quam inter prædicandum sequantur omnes, ad quam etiam observandam omnes Episcopi, & Parochi iurejurando adstringantur ut nemo ad munus Ecclesiasticum admittatur nisi spondens sibi illum doctrinæ consensum inviolatum futurum. Quod ad formulam precum, & rituum Ecclesiasticorum, valde probò ut certa illa extet, a qua Pastoribus discedere in functione sua non liceat — ut obviam eatur desultoria quorundam levitati, qui novationes quasdam affectant.

Here I understand him to require the Clergy to be obliged by Oath to receive, and Preach such a certain form of Doctrine, and to practise such Ecclesiastical Rites as shall be agreed upon by their Governours. In which thing if He speaks reason; what can more justify the proceedings of the Church-Catholick, in restraining not only her Subjects tongues, but tenents and opinions, in matters which she judgeth of necessary belief. ¶

Notwithstanding these evidences cited above, implying assent required to the Articles of the Church of England, yet her Divines, when charged therewith by Roman Catholicks, do return many answers and Apologies, whereby they seem either to deny any such thing; or at least do pretend a moderation therein very different from the Roman Tyranny.

1st. Then they say. [a] That they require not any oath, but a Subscription only to these their Articles. ||

2. [b] Require subscription only from their own, not from strangers. See Bishop Bramhall Vindic. p. 155. — And — This Church prescribes only to her own Children, whereas the Church of Rome severely imposes her Doctrine upon the whole World; saith Bishop Lawd ||

3. [c] Nor yet require it of all their own, but only those, who seek to be initiated into holy Orders, or are to be admitted to some Ecclesiastical preferment ||

4. [d] These Articles not penned with Anathemas, or curses, against all those, even of their own, who do not receive them.

5. [e] Subscription not required to them, as Articles of their Faith; or at least, as all of them Articles Fundamental of their Faith; as belief is required to all here as such, by the Church of Rome; but only required to them, as Theological verities ||, and Inferiour truths †

¶ To this purpose Bishop Bramhall Reply p. 350 — We do use to subscribe unto them indeed, not as Articles of Faith; but as Theological verities for the preservation of unity among our selves. — Again || — Though perhaps some of our negatives were revealed truths, and consequently were as necessary to be believed, when they are known, as affirmatives; yet they do not therefore

become

§ 80. 2. 4.

α.

β.

¶ Bish. Bramhall Reply to Chalc. p. 265.

¶ p. 52.

γ.

¶ Bish. Bramhall Vindic. p. 156.

δ.

ε.

¶ Bramh. Reply p. 350.

† Stillington p. 54.

¶ Ib. p. 277.

become such necessary truths, or Articles of Religion, as make up the rule of Faith; which rule of Faith (he saith there) consists of such supernatural truths, as are necessary to be known of every Christian, not only necessitate præcepti, because God hath commanded us to believe them; but also necessitate mediæ, because, without the knowledge of them, in some tolerable degree, according to the measure of our capacities, we cannot in an ordinary way attain to Salvation—And, ||—We do not (saith he) hold our 39. Articles to be such necessary truths, extra quas non est salus; nor enjoin Ecclesiastick persons to swear unto them; but only to subscribe them as Theological truths—And thus the Arch Bishop ||—All points are made Fundamental, and that to all mens belief, if that Church [the Roman] hath once determined them; whereas the Church of England never declared, that every one of her Articles are Fundamental in the Faith. ||

|| See Schism
guarded p.
396.
|| Reply p. 264

|| p. 51.

2.

To which they adde. [?] That as for those of these Articles, that are positive doctrines, and Articles of their Faith, they are such, as are grounded in Scripture, and General Truths, about which there is no controversy ||—and such (saith D. Stillingfleet †) as have the testimony, and approbation of the whole Christian world of all ages, and are acknowledged to be such by Rome it self.

|| Bramhall
Vindic. p. 159
† p. 54.

|| p. 52.

|| Vind. p. 159.

† Refl. p. 279.

|| Ibid. p. 277.

[?] And then; as for the rest of those Articles; they are only negative (as the Arch-Bishop ||); refusing there where the thing affirmed by the Roman-Church is not affirmed by Scripture, nor directly to be concluded out of it; —Or (as Bishop Bramhall ||) —They are no new articles, or innovations obruded upon any; but negations only of humane controverted Traditions †; and Refutations of the Roman supposititious principles ||—And though some of them were revealed truths, &c: as before, yet do they not therefore make up the rule of Faith [i. e. as this Rule is before explained.]

3.

|| p. 51.

[?] 6ly. That such subscription, whether of positives, or negatives is required by the Church of England to a few, in comparison of that multitude of Articles made on the other side. Though the Church of England, (saith the Archb. ||) I denounce Excommunication, as is before expressed, yet she comes far short of the Church of Romes severity, whose Anathema's are not only for 39. Articles, but for very many more; about one hundred, in the matter of Doctrine.

§. 80. n. 2.

7ly. [?] Concerning the just importance, and extent of such subscription, several expressions I find, that the Subscribers do not stand obliged thereby to believe these Articles; and the reason given, because the Church is fallible; but only not to oppose, not to contradict, them.

[?] To this purpose—We do not look (saith Bishop Bramhall

hall || Upon the Articles of the Church of England, as Essentials of || Bish. Bram-
 saving Faith, or Legacies of Christ, and his Apostles; but, in a bal. Schism
 mean, as pious opinions fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do guard, p. 190.
 we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them. — Stillingf.
 And, — Si quis diversum dixerit, we question him — Si quis diver- P. 55.
 sum sentierit, if any man think otherwise in his private opinion, and
 trouble not the peace of the Church, we question him not || — Again : || Vindic.
 — Never any son of the Church of England was punished for dissent- P. 156.
 ing from the Articles in his judgement, so he did not publish it by word,
 or writing. — After the same manner speaks Dr. Stillingfleet || — P. 104.
 The Church of England excommunicates such, as openly oppose her
 Doctrine, supposing her faithless; the Roman Church excommunicates all,
 who will not believe, whatever she desires to be infallibly true. — And
 — The Church of England bindeth men to peace to the Church's De-
 terminations, (refraining to men the liberty of their judgements) on
 pain of excom. Excommunication, if they violate that peace. — And
 Mr. Chillingworth saith, || — That Protestants cannot, with co- || P. 375.
 herence to their own grounds, require of others the belief of any thing
 besides Scripture, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable, conse-
 quences of it, without most high, and most Schismatical presumption.
 [plain, irrefragable, indubitable, consequences; such therefore can-
 not be the most of the 39. Articles, we know by how great a part
 of Christianity controverted, denied.] Lastly, thus the Arch-
 Bishop answering to the fifth Canon of the Church of England ob-
 jected by A. C. || — It is nothing for a man to hold an opinion pri- || P. 39.]
 vately within himself; and another thing, boldly, and publicly to
 affirm it. [as if that Canon prohibited only the latter of these].

This then, seems of late the commoner exposition of sub-
 scription, and most suitable to the Protestant Principles.]

§. 80. n. 32.
 8. But 8ly. — [2.] Some other expressions also fall from
 the same Writers, and others, intimating assent required.
 For 1st. The Arch-bishop saith, concerning the fifth Article; that,
 perhaps, only publick affirmation, is the sense of it, but speaks no-
 thing clearly against assent required by it; and I suppose, he saw
 good reason for it. I pray you view the place in him. So, in the
 precedent page, he saith, — The Church of England is not such a
 stern teacher Children, as to deny her blessing, or denounce an Anathema
 against them, if some peaceably dissension some particulars, removed
 from the Foundation. [Where this restriction, removed from the
 Foundation, seems so to indulge dissent, in respect of some of the
 39. Articles, as that she doth not allow it generally in respect of
 them all; unless any will say, all the Articles are such]. — So
 M. W. in his Answer to M. Cressy amongst other (ifs) puts in || P. 100.
 this

|| Reply.
§. 349.

this for one.—If they [the English Church-Governours] require a positive assent, it is because the thing determined, is so evident in Scripture, &c. We do use (saith Bishop Bramhall) to subscribe unto them indeed, not as Articles of Faith, but as Theological verities, [Is not this a subscribing, that they assent to, or hold them for Theological verities?]—So p. 264. We do require Ecclesiastical persons only to subscribe them as Theological Truths; for the preservation of unity among us, [should he not say Unity of truth?] and the extirpation of some growing errors—(and Dr. Stillingfleet useth the same expression from him). [To subscribe them as Theological Truths; meaneth he not here, to subscribe, that they are Theological Truths?]

|| §. 79. n. 3.

For the preservation of unity; means he not, unity of Opinion, and of the Profession of such Truths? As the title also prefixed to the Articles, (mentioned before), imports; saying,—That the Articles were drawn up for the avoiding diversity of Opinions, and establishing consent; Else, where diversity of Opinion is allowed in all things, what extirpation of errors (which follows in the next words) can be hoped?

§. 80. n. 4.

14.

9. [p.] Lastly, I finde frequent mention in these Authors of a conditional assent, or belief, required (in general) as due to the Church's proposals whether concerning matters of Faith, or other constitutions: (yet without any particular application thereof to the 39. Articles.) Conditional, viz. —Then, * when a person is not competent to search her grounds; or, * where the Church adheres to, and forsakes no part of, the Apostles' depositum —or * when she proveth, and evidenceth to them the truth of what she proposeth; or, * so long, as they cannot evidence and prove to her the contrary. But then; they leave the judgment of this condition, (when she sufficiently proves such a thing; or they the contrary; when the party is not competent to search grounds; or when the Church adheres not to the Apostles' Depositum) to themselves; and not to the Church; reserving to every private person the ultimate judgment; a judgment of discretion, as they call it. See D. Ferne's Case between the two Churches, p. 40, 48, 49. — Division of Churches, p. 45, 47, 61. — Considerations, p. 19. — Dr. Field, p. 686. — Dr. Jackson on the Creed, l. 2. v. 5. and 6. (out of which see some Quotations before, Disc. 2. §. 26.) — Dr. Hammond's Answer to a Catholick Gentleman, p. 16, 17. — Dispatcher dispatched, c. 5. p. 358.

§. 81. n. 7.

Having seen this defence of Learned Protestants for the Church of England her composing new Articles of Religion, and exacting of her Subjects subscription, and conformity to them; wherein

wherein they endeavour to represent, the Yoke of these her *Articles*, and her *Excommunications* very light (though the Presbyterians groan under the weight thereof), in comparison of that of the *Roman Canons*, and their *Anathemas*. Now give me leave, to make some reflections, on what they have said; and out of these to return answers to the precedents, so far as it seems necessary.

1st. Then, this is clear; that, they confining their *Rule of Obs. 1.* Faith within as narrow a compass as they please, yet some of their 39. Articles will be found to be a part of it; and to be such *supernatural truths*, as are necessary to be known of every Christian, necessitate medii, and such, as extra quos non est salus; as well as some of those in *Pius's Bull*, or in the Council of *Trent*, are. Of this sort must several of the first, 8. Articles be, concerning the *Trinity*, *Son of God*, &c. And I ask, whether they are not willing, that some other of them [as 9. *The fall of Adam*: 18. *Salvation only by Christ*; 19. *Christ only without sin*; 11. *Justification by Faith only*, 25. 27. *Two Sacraments ordained by Christ*, and these not only bare signs but effectual Instruments of Grace; 6. *Sufficiency of the holy Scripture for Salvation*] be admitted into the Rule of the *Protestant's Faith*; but thrown amongst *Theological*, and *inferior*, *verities*. Since then it is most certain, that some of their *Articles* are part, of their *Rule*, and of the most necessary, and fundamental Faith: Next, I ask concerning these; whether, in the liberty they profess in the Church, and the want of it they accuse in the Roman, they require no assent, from their Subjects or at least from those of them, whom they admit to *H. Orders*, and Ecclesiastical Preferments, to these *Articles*? or whether they do not require them to profess and teach all, or some of them at least? which they cannot do, unless they also oblige them to hold them: (for none may profess against what he thinks; and therefore who is tied, by them, to profess so, is by them tyed to think so). But if they do not require such assent; then may one, that holds against them the contrary Doctrines, in several of the prime Articles of their Faith, not only enjoy their Communion, but sit down among their Doctors; only, if as he believeth, professeth, or teacheth none of these Articles, so he do not teach, or profess the contrary, but spend his discourses on other subjects. See now whether there may not be some reason for that which is observed before, §. 80. n. 3. concerning the Arch-bishop.

2ly. Concerning those other Articles, of which it is said, that

Obs. 2.

§. 81. n. 2.

¶ Reply to
Chalcedon.
p. 227.

that they are no *new positive* Articles of the Protestant Faith, but only *negations*, and refutations of new Roman assertions, and additions. You may note concerning them, 1st. In General: that Negatives may be Scripture-truths, revealed therein, matter of our Faith, and as necessary to be believed (as Bishop Bramhall granteth) when known to be revealed, as any affirmative, and positive Articles are; and the most Fundamental Articles may be as well negatively, as affirmatively proposed; and, seeing that the one necessarily implies, and infers the other, as one is *ratione medii* necessary to Salvation, so is the other. So the negative Articles in the *Nicen*, or *Athanasian Creed* *Pater non creatus*—*nullo genitus*—*non tres Patres*—*Filius non factus*—*Filius unus non* conversione divinitatis in carnem, aut confusione Substantialium—are Articles of as necessary belief, as the positives; and indeed the same with them; the same with—*Pater unus*—*Pater aternus*, *Filius genitus*—*Filius ex duabus naturis consistens*. And they as much Hereticks, that affirm any of these negatives, as that deny the affirmatives.

2^{ly}, Concerning the Negatives, in the 39. Articles of the Church of England, if they be well considered, you may find, that they are both, in the Articles, pretended to be Scripture, and revealed truths; and that all or most of them are equivalent to affirmatives; and *new*, and *positive*: on the one side, as the Roman Articles, which they contradict are pretended, on the other; and the Protestants Confession of Faith (supposing him obliged to believe these Negatives) as large and as particular on the one side, as the Roman, or Tridentine is on the other, as to the main Controversies that are bandied between the two Churches; and these not only *privatively*, but *positively* opposite.

For no difference can be made in the thing (but only in the expression) between a negative, and positive Article, where the negative implies, and is equivalent to, the affirmative of its contrary; as it is, where the contraries are immediate, and the one of them is necessarily put, wherever the other denied. As, God being granted a substance, He that denies him to be a corporeal substance, in this he affirms him to be a Spiritual; and so, those that deny here something which others affirm, in this must needs affirm something, which the others deny; and the negative may be (as we please) changed into another positive; and he who had before the positive, shall have now the negative, side.

He, that denies any Souls after this life to go into any temporal purgatory, affirms them to go into Bliss, or Pain, Eternal; and he that affirms Purgatory, denies this; So, he that denies a Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, affirms the Sub-
stance

stance of the Symbols to remain there; and so *e contra*. Hence he that hath 39. Articles of his Faith, whereof 30. are in the expression negative, 9. positive, hath, in matters, wherein, the one contrary being excluded, the other is admitted (as it is in most of these Articles of Religion, that are in debate) no fewer positive Articles of his Faith, than he, who hath 39. expressly positive; and again, he who hath 39 positive cannot but have 39. Negative also, and *e contra*: (only a negative confession argues a former contest). And as Faith, so Heresie, is conversant in either.

And here also note: that it is one thing for a Church meerly to exclude from, or omit in, her Articles or confessions of Faith, those points, which another Church defineth: (i. e.) not to tye her Subjects to believe them; and another thing, to tye her Subjects to believe the Negatives of them, or not to believe them. Which is indeed a defining one way, as much as the other Church doth the other way. For Example: 'Tis one thing, not to tye her Subjects to believe or hold, the *Roman Doctrine, concerning Purgatory Pardons, Images, Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, &c.* and another thing, to tye her Subjects to believe, or hold, that the *Romish Doctrines concerning Purgatory, &c.* are vainly invented, or grounded on no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God: as it is in the 22. Article Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Neither can the Church of Rome be here more justly questioned, in her not leaving points in Uuiversals only, and their former indifference; but new-stating Purgatory, Transubstantiation, &c. than the Reformed, for their new-stating the contrary to these.

Which to make more prespicuous: It is to be noted, that of those, who seem in their Theological Positions to affirm less, and so to make fewer Articles of their Faith than some others do, there are two sorts.

1. Either such, as peremptorily deny the truth of those additional, which the other affirm. 2. Or such, as do suspend their judgment concerning such additional; neither affirming, nor denying them for truths; only denying, that the others as yet do prove or evidence them to be so. Now though it may be said of these later; that indeed they do not make so many Articles of Faith or new definitions, as the other do; and so also, that they seem much more safe, and modest in the paucity of their *Credends*; because they, who neither affirm, nor deny a Tenent, cannot err in it; yet the former, who deny as far, and as peremptorily every new point, as the other affirm it, these can free themselves from no curiosity, tyranny, liableness to errour, &c. wherein they pretend the other to transgress: nor can plead any safety in their Doctrine, (viz. in their

§. 81. n. 3.

not erring, because. not *determining*); but do engage every whit as far in such points, as their adversaries do; one in holding, and endeavouring to prove such a thing a truth; the other in holding, and endeavouring to prove it an error. And this is the case of the Church of *England*; which suspends not her judgment in those new points which the *Roman* defines; nor denies them onely to be *proved*, or *clear*, in the Scripture; but denies them as *Errors*, and things *contrary* to Scripture: So: *Purgatory*, *Adoration of Images and Reliques*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Indulgences*, are declared repugnant to Gods Word, Art. 22.—*Works of Supererogation*, Art. 14.—*Publick Prayer, or Ministry of the Sacraments in a Tongue not understood by the People*, Art. 24.—*Denying of the Cup to the People*, Art. 30.—*Sacrifice of the Mass*, Art. 31.—*Transubstantiation*, Art. 28. Now he that believes Transubstantiation, for Example, to be contrary to Scripture, makes the contrary to Transubstantiation to be Scripture, & so to be also a point of his Faith, if Scripture be so: and hence the English Church in obliging her Subjects to believe these points Errors, which, the Roman Church doth hers to believe Truths, hath in this as large a Creed as the other: if the other hath *Twelve* new Articles, so, in her stating the contrary to them, hath she; and is equally tyrannical (or more, because the Articles of the other are the elder of the two;) the Subjects of the one having no liberty left to affirm them; as, of the other, to deny them. For Example. A Subject of the Church of *England* (supposing him obliged to believe her Articles true) hath no more liberty left to hold Transubstantiation a Truth, than a Romanist hath to hold it an Error: Or, (to instance in the implied affirmative, that is maintained in opposition to Transubstantiation on the Church of *Englands* side,) a Subject of this Church hath no more liberty left to hold the remaining of the Substance of the Symbols in the Eucharist an Error, than those of the Roman have, to hold it a Truth. This of the first sort: those, who as peremptorily deny a thing, as the other affirm it.

But next, you may observe; that neither are the latter sort, who suspend their judgment because such point seems not proved to them, in this always the most secure, and safe, If the Proposers to them of that point be such persons as they are commanded to believe, unless themselves can prove the contrary to it; (which is the case of all those, who have *Spiritual Superiours*;) and, if the knowledge of such a Truth be any way profitable to their Salvation; which Truths, I suppose, these Superiours never define, without foreseeing, first, such Doctrines, defined, beneficial to be known. This from §. 81. n. 2. is my

Second

Second Observation concerning the Church of *Englands* negative Articles.

317. You may observe : that, when these Protestant Writers say, that these 39 Articles (that is, the most of them, or the negatives, see Observation 1. ||) are not made by them Articles of their Faith, they explain themselves to mean, not made *fundamental* Articles of their Faith ; or such, the belief of which is necessary *ratione medii* for attaining Salvation ; and such, as *extra quas [creditas] non est salus* || ; they meanwhile not denying ; that || *§. 81. n. 4. Obs. 3. §. 80. n. 1.* whatever is *Scripturæ*, and a revealed *Divine Truth*, is an Article of our Faith, i. e. (as Bp. Bramhall) *Necessary to be believed, and assented to by us, when it is known to be revealed.* Now, as they do not make the most of their 39 Articles, the rule, or articles, of their Faith in the forenamed sense ; so neither doth the *Roman Church*, or *Council of Trent*, her Canons, whatever Protestants tell the World, so often, to the contrary : *Fundamental* indeed they call, sometimes, all points defined by the Church's Councils ; and hold them *necessary* to be believed, for attaining Salvation ; but, not *necessary* in such a sense, as *ratione medii* necessary ; or absolutely *extra quas [creditas] non est salus* ; but only necessary to be believed upon supposition of a *sufficient proposal* of them made to any person, that they have been so defined. Again, necessarily to be believed also, for attaining *Salvation* ; not because that no person can be saved, and that, after the Church's definition of them, in his not believing them ; But because if, after such proposal, and sufficient notice given him of their being defined, he believe them not, he now stands guilty (in this his disobedience to his supreme spiritual Guides) of a mortal sin (unpunished of) destructive of his *Salvation*.

[A thing spoken plainly enough by the answerer of the Archbishops Book, and yet misrepresented by the Replier, || who || *§. 81. n. 5. p. 48 n. 9.* targeth these propositions as maintained by the Roman Church: *That what the Church determines as matter of Faith is as necessary to be believed in order to Salvation, as that which is necessary from the matter, [i. e. necessary, ratione medii.] — And that an equal explicit faith is required to the definitions of the Church, as to the Articles of the Creed ; and that there is an equal necessity in order to Salvation, of believing both of them :* Whenas he might easily have informed himself, that there is not an equal necessity required by the Roman Church of the very Articles of the Creed in order to Salvation ; and whenas, not only this one condition, of the Church's having defined them (for none are obliged necessarily

to believe explicitly whatsoever the Church hath defined;) but a second, also, of a sufficient proposal to us of what the Church hath defined, renders her Definitions necessary to be believed; and then, necessary to be believed indeed as to the doing of our duty in order to our Salvation; but not all of them necessary to be believed, as if the knowledge of them were so necessary to our Salvation, as that without this it could not be had, as that of some of the Articles of the Creed is.

Neither is the Greek Church (one ground of this authors mistake) by F. Fisher or others of the Roman Church, charged as guilty of *Heresie*, in any other manner save this; that, supposing a lawful General Council, accepted by the Church Catholick, to have defined *The procession of the H. Ghost a Filio*, so many of the Greek Church as have received a sufficient proposal, that such a Council hath so defined it, if they continue to deny, or disbelieve it, are guilty of *Heresie*; leaving the rest free; (unless it can be proved, that a *Filio* is a Fundamental in the other sense, *i. e. ratione modii*.) First I say, so many amongst them as happen to be either by natural defect and incapacity, or external want of instruction, *irremediably* and *incurably* ignorant, either of the just authority of such a Council; or, of its Divinely-assisted inerrability in all necessities; or, of such its Decree; or, of the true sense thereof; which persons indeed, by reason of the *evidence* of all these things, cannot be the most, or the learned; but yet, may be some; for all in an Heretical Church are not affirmed *Herenicks*; though the Church's censures, according to the reasonable grounds of conviction concerning any such point generally published, are passed upon all that are involved in such a Society; whilst God, who knows all capacities absolves from such censures whom he seeth innocent; and preserves his wheat from the fire, though, by the Church bound in the same bundle with the Tares.

As for the other ground of the Repliers mistake; || That famous passage of *Pius*, [*Hanc Veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam &c.*] he might have learned to have made a more moderate and qualified contradiction of it; from his own descant on the like clause in the Achanasian Creed, [*Hæc est Fides Catholica quam nris quisque &c.*] where he could well discover a conditional necessity, as to some of the Articles thereof, *Viz.* A necessity of believing them upon conviction, that they were of Divine Revelation: why not then allow such a one here: *extra quam nulla salus*, *i. e.* to such as receive a sufficient proposal of their being so defined; and therefore do, or might, receive a sufficient conviction that they must also be Divine Truth? Though for a fuller answer to that clause of *Pius*, I must refer you

to

|| *Stillings.*
p. 48.

|| p. 70. 71.

to the Considerations on the Council of Trent; §. 104. &c. Now to proceed in our Discourse.]

Fundamental therefore the Church of Rome affirms many of her Canons (for I speak not of all) not so to be; but that 1st. A Christian may be ignorant of them, without loss of his salvation; and indeed, amongst the vulgar, who is there, that is not ignorant of several of them? Onely in time of need, and where danger of seducement, as any Canon is of greater moment, or the truth thereof particularly invaded, the Pastors are vigilant to inform their Sheep of the Church's former definitions of them. 2^{ly}. Nay further, may hold the contrary to some of them though defined, yet if not sufficiently proposed to him that they are so; without loss of salvation. 3^{ly}. In ones holding the contrary to them, after sufficiently proposed, (I mean, both the decree manifested to him, and the just authority that made it, and the divine assistance thereof) the loss of salvation doth not ensue, nor the Church's censures take hold on such a person, for the simple non-believing the matter of such Canon, or for the holding of the contrary. [For, if this, *the meer non-believing* or the *holding of the contrary* to any Church-definition whatever, abstracting from a sufficient Proposal that such thing hath been defined by the Church, were enough to destroy any ones salvation; then so this would be, before the Church's determination of such Point; or so this would be to the invincibly ignorant, after it; a thing which no Catholick affirms; and see S. *Ausinus* treating of this matter, *de Bapt. l. 4. c. 16.* before §. 18. Though it is freely granted here, that the ignorance of such a truth as is beneficial for our salvation, (which all definitions of Councils are supposed to be, to some or other) both after, and also before the Councils defining thereof, may confer something, in its degree, according to the benefit of the truth one miscarries in, to the loss of his salvation.] The Church's censures therefore, I say, as to many of her Canons, are incurr'd and salvation ruin'd, not for the *meer disbelieving* such Point defined, but for *obstinately* doing this after sufficient ground of conviction, that such an authority hath so defin'd it. — *Postquam en qua ad fidem pertinent auctoritate Universalis Ecclesie determinata sunt, si quis tali ordinationi pertinaciter repugnat, hæreticus censetur* ||. And *ib. q. 5. m. 3.* — *Si quis non pertinaciter discre-*

§. 81. m. 6.

dit articulum fidei paratus sequi in omnibus doctrinam Ecclesie, jam non est Hæreticus sed solum errans. — Qui autem ex ignorantia crassa vel etiam affectata (saith Layman out of the common Doctrine of the Casuists) *propter inquirendi radium, &c. errat aliquem contra fidem seute, error statim derelicturus, si intel-* ligat

1 S. Thom. 22.
11. q. 2. 2.

† Théol. moral. l. 2. Tract. 1. c. 13.

|| §. 79.

ligat. Catholica Ecclesia repugnare esse, talis non est pertinax nec Hæreticus So that the Church's *Anathema*, in many of her Canons, seizeth on a person, not so much for the matter of his error, (though this not denied to some degree hurtful to him, and diminishing his perfection in the Faith) as for the *pertinacy* of his erring, and the contumacie and perverseness of his will, disobeying the Church and his Spiritual Superiors, sufficiently manifesting the contrary truth to be her Doctrine and a portion of the Christian Faith; and manifesting it always for some good ends, of preserving her Sons orthodox in such parts thereof as she sees to be invaded by some contrary error of perilous consequence. Now let it be considered, whether the Church of *England*, if the sense of the 5th Canon (related above) stand good, doth not make her 39 Articles Fundamental, and exclude from Salvation those, who affirm, or hold any of them erroneous, on the same manner: whilst she excommunicates, *i.e.* cuts off from the Body of Christ (if the Excommunication be just, as she thinks it is) such persons, as remain in this wicked error, till such time as they repent, and publicly revoke it. For, I ask, what is this wicked error, for which, unrepented of, he is so cut off from Christ, and consequently his Salvation destroyed; but his holding, or (if you will) his not repenting upon her Admonition but persisting to hold, the contrary to some one or more of her Articles. or Definitions? if she declare then his Salvation lost in his holding the contrary to such Article; is not the Article then after her proposal made, in the sense we are speaking of, fundamental to him? Or, suppose his wicked error be not holding, but saying the contrary to such Article when he holds otherwise; (which I cannot apprehend to be sense, *i.e.* that any one can be said to erre in a thing, when he saith onely, that he holds it, but really doth not hold it) at least thus far then, as to non-contradiction, the Article still is made fundamental, for here whoever contradicts (unrepenting thereof) is damned.

4ly. For the application of *Hæc est Fides, extra quam non est salus*, which is so often said, by Protestants, to be made to all the Definitions of the Council of *Trent*; and confession thereof necessary to the enjoying of the Communion of this Church. 1st. No such Sentence is applied to the definitions by the Council it self, (except onely to the *Nicene Creed*; of which they say: it is *Fundamentum primum & unicum*, Sess. 3.) but onely by a Pope, after it. And 2ly. If we should also grant the sense of this clause to be that, which Protestants put upon it, (whence it is capable of another sense, which they cannot disallow, of which see *Consid. on the Conn. of Trent*, §. 192. 195.) namely this; that an explicit belief of every

every one of the Definitions, and Contents of all the said General Councils, that have ever been, or made any thing, for the breaking of all Canons of Councils, as well as those of *Trent*, *Tridentina Synodo*, &c. *Decretum Concilii*, &c. *strada*, *definita*, & *deklarata*. It is necessary to every one, and to none mediis, for attaining Salvation. For since the Protestants will needs understand it, (a thing so irrational, that any one may see, that a Church, that holds this, must damn all, or most of her children; for who is there, especially among the laity or vulgar, that hath an actual knowledge, or explicit faith, of every Canon of every lawful General Council, that hath been in the Church?) Yet is it not required by *Pope* of *all men*, that they assent to this truth for their enjoying the Roman Communion, but only of those, who enter into *Sacred Orders*, or *Religions*. But altho It may be noted also concerning this Bull of *Claus*, which seems of a long time, the main grievance of Protestants: the main Apology for their relinquishing the Roman Communion, and that in which she is chiefly charged, to have violated the *Unity* of the *Catholic Church*. (1.) that it came forth many years after the Protestants' discession from this Church: whether we look at *Luther's*; or that under King *Edward*; or the last under Queen *Elizabeth*; and many years too, after the birth of their *Articles* made against the *Roman Faith*; both after those composed under *Edward VI.* A. D. 1549. and reconfirmed under Queen *Elizabeth*, 1562. This Bull not being made till 1564. So that herein, they seem to take their chiefest excuse for their discession from that Church, from a thing that happened long after it: as if they departed from it out of the foresight of an offence, which, though it then was not, yet would be given them, by it.

The 4th thing I have to observe to you (touched before) is, that, though the Church of *England* in her Synod, affixeth not particular *Anathemas* to her Articles, as the Roman Catholics doth in that of *Trent*, with a *Si quis dixerit*, &c. *Anathema sit*; yet the fore-mentioned 15th Canon of this Church pronounceth in general an Excommunication to a *Schismatic*, *heretic*, that any of these Articles is in any part, erroneous. The weighty value of which Excommunication also you may learn out of their Art. 32.

These things premised: how to speak briefly to the former Protestant Defence made, §. 80.

To 1. I answer: that, by the instances in the Canons, &c. Resp. to a. produced before, §. 70. n. 1. and some of the expressions, §. 80. n. 3.

9. 07
of the 101
no. 1260
12. 1260
12. 1260
12. 1260

Striling.

P. 55.

§. 81. n. 7.

Obf. 4.

§. 81. n. 8.

the Church, Governours intention in requiring this Subscription seems to be, *Assent*. And in Synod, Carol. 1663. See an Oath mentioned before, §. 70. 1. 3. That he doth not approve and sincerely acknowledge the Doctrine established in the Church of England, & containing all things necessary to Salvation; In which yet this Synod being fallible, may erre; as suppose, in the Arrian Controversie.

To B.
Of which see
Confid. on
Counc. of
Trent. §. 9. &c.
Of which see
Ibid. §. 35.

To γ.

To [1]. That as the Church of England requires submission to her Articles only from her own Children, or Subjects: So doth the Council of *Trinis*; whose Subjects, if it be a General one, is all Christianity; if a Patriarchal; all the Western Churches; and amongst the rest that of England. One or a few Metropolitan Churches that dissent owing submission of judgment to the definitions of the rest joyned with the Bishop of Rome, their Patriarch; as it was in the Primitive Councils.

To [2]. That as subscription to the Articles in the Church of England is only required from those, who are to be initiated into holy Orders, or admitted to Ecclesiastical Preferment; so is *Pius* oath to the Canons, only exacted from those, who enter into sacred Orders, or Religions. But as the *Anathema*; in the Council of *Trinis* extend to all persons, so doth the Excommunication of the Church of England. Can. 5.

To Δ

To [2]. That, though there are not Penned with a particular *Anathema*, yet they are with a general Excommunication. Can. 5.

To ε.

To [1]. That as not by them to their Articles; so neither by the Church of Rome to her Canons, is subscription required as to Articles of her Faith, or Articles Fundamental. If Faith or Fundamental be understood in such a sense, as the Protestant quotations above explain them: This hath been shewed, §. 81. n. 5. 6.

To ζ.

To [2]. By this it is confessed; that of the 39. Articles no more are Articles of the Church of England's Faith, than those only, wherein Rome doth agree with her; and then, if to the rest of her Articles, no assent be exacted of any, as is contended above, §. 80. out; in all things believing and being of the same perswasion with the Church of Rome, is freely admitted into the Church of England's Communion; nay, may (without violation of her constitutions) lawfully enter into her holy Orders, and Ecclesiastical preferments; and there remain without any engagement to defend the Church of England's Doctrine; or teach, and instruct the people against the Roman Errors.

To η.

To [1]. That her Negative Articles involve Affirmatives (and those are presented under Revelations; see before §. 81. n. 3. which are the objects of Faith) and so bind to assent on one side,

as the *Roman* Canons do on the other; and supposing assent required to them, do admit as little latitude of opinion; and as *Luther's* appearance the matter of these *Roman* Canons, being in possession, as to the common belief and practice of the Church, these Negatives of them, of the two, will prove the *affirmatives*.

Lastly, In what sense Protestants say these *Negatives* are no Articles of their Faith, i. e. faith necessary *salvificum* (to salvation) in the same sense the *Roman* Church saith, neither are her Positives, that contradict them.

To [5]. Of the many *Canons* in the Council of *Trent*, made in opposition to them, *Luther's* many errors and innovations of *Doctrines*, which were daily collected and brought into the Council, were the cause. And as to the *main points*, that are in debate between the Church of *Rome* and of *England*, the *Negatives* in the *English* Articles equal in their number the *Affirmatives* in the *Canons* of *Trent*.

To [6]. Whether assent to the Articles be required in subscription, or only non-contradiction, as to any uniform accord in their later Writers, I see nothing clear; and the latter seems more agreeable with their Principles; but in the former instances out of some *Canons*, &c. Assent seems as strictly required in this Church, and that upon Excommunication, as in the *Roman* upon *Anathema*; and the Act of Parliament *Elizabeth* 13. recited before §. 28. n. 1. (an Act passed, not only by the Lords Temporal, but Spiritual, i. e. the Governours of this Church) is most express for it. Review it.

To [7]. It is true also in the *Roman* Church, that thought is free; and, *Ecclesia non judicat de oculis*; or, *peccatus mere impunitus*, &c. no way discovered; but true also, that the Ecclesiastical Magistrate may lawfully enquire into mens thoughts and beliefs; and question a person herein (for this is done in Baptism) and true, that not only words are punishable as faults by this Magistrate, but thoughts, if any one shall reveal, that he thinks so; i. e. thoughts when they are any way discovered (as any one, upon examination, manifesting any blasphemous thoughts or tenets of his, may be lawfully excommunicated; and, in such a case, is excommunicated, not for the revealing them in word, but for the holding them so, who designs a treason, and afterward reveals it, is justly punished, not for the revealing, but designing thereof); and thus the Church of *Rome* doth; and if the Church of *England* extend not her Inquisition, or censures thus far, especially as to those persons, she admits into the Clergy, she may expect a *Rebel* of Religions, and dissenting judgments, in points of greatest consequence,

To 3.

To 2.

§. 81. n. 9.

To 2.

§ 81. n. 10.

To H.

sequence, under the mask of his external Communion.
 To [H.] Only a *conditional* Assent, seems to signify little for establishing Unity of Faith, or consent in Religion, which eyes none to, but that, of two subscribers, one may absolutely assent, another dissent: the same person assent to day, dissent to-morrow. And a *Stipulant* content of his opinion, as freely subscribe, as any other of the *Reformed*; a *Presbyterian*, as a *Episcopist*. For, since the judgement here concerning the condition, [*viz.* when the Church proves what she proposes; or, when the Subscriber proves the contrary;] where he is competent to search grounds; or when the Church is *unfalsified* in conserving her *Deposition*.] is left, not to the Church, but to the *Subscriber*, it casts the *assent*, and *assent* also wholly into his disposal and arbitrement; and note here also, that who may require only a conditional assent, can likewise exact only, in such points as are practical, a conditional conformity; i. e. that none be absolutely enjoined to practise such a thing, but only upon supposition, that the Church first prove it to him lawful to be done; or that he cannot prove it to the Church to be unlawful; or that he is a person unable to search the grounds of the lawfulness, or unlawfulness thereof, &c. (of which conditions himself also, nor the Church, is judg.) For otherwise, he that obliges a person absolutely to the performance of a thing, obliges him also absolutely to the believing that thing lawful to be done, which since the Church of England not owning, neither may he think, nor; and, who ought to have his liberty for the one, ought so, for the other too.

Now 'tis ordinary in the *English* Canons to require, upon pain of Excommunication, conformity to her Constitutions; where, had this secret been known to the *Presbyterians*, that it is understood only of *such a conditional* conformity, supposition, would have been no cause of their forbearing subscription, or complaining of the *English* Church-Laws their being as rigorous, and unjust, as those of *Rome*.

§ 81. n. 11.

Thus I have made a search into the obedience, which is required of her Subjects by a Church, that seems nor well grounded in her authority; by reason that having disowned herself from that which she acknowledges was formerly the Catholic Church and from Superior Councils, she can neither lay claim to that *Authority*, which from our Lords perpetual superintendency, resides in the *people*. (as all members, thoroughly consenting with the whole, and guided by it, do lay claim to such infallibility, and therefore do require obedience from their Subjects, in the same manner as the *Rome* both as to all such doctrines, wherein,

wherein they agree with the whole, nor can she, standing apart, and alleging the reason of it the former Church's errors, have the confidence to claim a new Infallibility to her self: and therefore it is no wonder, if there seem some uncertainty, what obedience she requireth, where there is, what authority she possesseth; and where such obedience is grounded rather on the pretended clear evidence of the matter proposed, than the sovereign, and undecidable authority of the Proposer.

Meanwhile, whether she challengeth an obedience of assent from her Subjects, or that of non-contradiction, I see not, how she can be justified either by the Laws of the Church, or by her own Principles.

For, 1st. By the Laws of the Church, if she justly require assent from her Inferiours, might not her Superiours demand the same from her: and was she not in conscience obliged to yield it? These, as well as she, determining nothing, but what they think a clear truth.

Or can she blame the fallible Church of Rome, for requiring assent to her Canons, upon *Anathema*, when the fallible requires the same, upon *Excommunication*? For the difficulties, that are made here, have been formerly answered: and any evidence or authority, Protestants pretend for those Doctrines, to which they require assent, the Roman Church pleads the like for hers; and so, *sub judice lis est*.

Concerning this hear Mr. Chillingworth, † anything, besides Scripture, and the plain, irrefragable, in- † E. 373.
dubitable consequences of it [I suppose, he means, appearing such not only to the Church-Governours, but their Subjects; and that he holds also, that all the 39. Articles have not such an evidence,]

will may Protestants hold is no matter of opinion: but, as matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they, with coherence to their own grounds, believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical presumption.

But 2^{ly}. If, laying assent aside, only a non-contradiction of her Articles, or a non-affirmation that they are any way erroneous, is required, upon excommunication of the person so offending; yet neither will this be justifiable by the Laws of the Church; for no Canon of a National Synod can justly pronounce Excommunication on any, for affirming to many points in their Articles erroneous, as have been determined by Superior Councils, (a General, or a Patriarchal Synod) contrary. For example: It is not lawful for a National Synod in England to excommunicate a person for affirming their Articles erroneous in denying *Transubstantiation*; because this hath been determined affirmatively by many former Superior Synods, accepted by the whole Western Church; (as is shewed before. 1. Dile. §. 37.) which therefore oblige Christians to the belief.

belief, and profession of it, against the Decrees of any Inferior Western Synod. Neither 2ly. Do they seem to inflict Excommunication on every one, that *affirms* any of their Articles erroneous, without condemning their *own Principles*; because, what they say of General Councils, is as true, I suppose, for their own Synod: *viz.* That they may *err grossly and manifestly*; in which case, they say, one may *lawfully affirm* these Councils; in such thing, erroneous; else how can they ever be corrected; (See before §. 43, 44. &c.) The case, therefore, is the same, as to *their own Synods*. And then, for that, they say a person may lawfully do, they cannot lawfully excommunicate him.

§. 81. n. 13.

But if it be replied, that their Synods challenge an obedience of non-contradiction onely to what they are *certain* is truth; and therefore none may lawfully in such case contradict them, or affirm they erre.

1st. It follows, they may, upon the same terms, require *assent* also; of which they seem more shje.

But 2ly. As theirs plead certainty, so do other Councils, whom yet they will not excuse upon this pretence, for requiring Assent, as hath been but now said.

3ly. It seems unreasonable, that a Certainty, either from the Sense of Scripture, necessary Deduction, former Universall Tradition, or any other way, should be pretended by a particular Church in any such matters, from which Church a *Major* part of Christianity, perusing the same Evidences, dissents: Such as are severall of the 39. Articles.

† Diff. 2. §. 5.
— Diff. 4. §.
11, 12.

4ly. Protestants themselves affirm, that those who are certain of Truth yet may not require an *absolute* but *Conditional* Assent from others; who, first, know them in generall to be fallible; and next, do not know or have it not proved to them that in this particular whereto they require assent, they erre not. See before §. 81. n. 10. And the same they say for *Non-Contradiction* required, that it must be only *Conditional* (i. e.) if the contrary Truth to that error defined do not appear to the Church's Subjects necessary to be divulged.

Meanwhile, It is not denied (which was also but now said) that particular Churches, or Provinciaall Synods, may be certain of something as Truth, where either Scripture saith it, or a necessary Deduction collecteth it, or Tradition delivereth it, when these are such, or are generally undisputed and unquestioned: and such Churches or Synods, may require from their Subjects an *absolute Assent* and that upon *Excommunication* or *Anathema* to all such Articles of Religion as are either defined, or otherwise agreed on by the whole Catholick Church: and that herein they have the same *Infallibility* as the Catholick; and their Subjects

Subjects are or may be convinced, that they are the Tenents of the Church Catholick. As the Church of England, tho otherwise fallible, may require not a Conditional but an Absolute Assent to the Articles of the *Athanasian Creed*; because she in these is infallible, if the Catholick Church be so.

Thus much said concerning the Quality of the submission required of her Sons by the Church of England to her Articles of Religion. I now proceed to the Second thing proposed before §. 66. to shew the accord of the Eastern Churches with the Roman in the most principal modern Controversies, and particularly in those mentioned before, §. 26. &c. whereby that may be further confirmed that hath been formerly || asserted, viz, That in what the Reformers deserted the Roman, they also opposed the whole Body of the Catholick Church then in being, though the Eastern Churches be also included as members thereof. §. 31.

CHAP. VIII.

The Eastern Churches consenting with the Roman.

The consent of the Doctrine and Practice of the modern Eastern Churches with the Occidental against Protestants, in the chief Points of present Controversie. [1. Transubstantiation, §. 158. n. 2. & 177. 2. Adoration of the Eucharist, §. 159. 177. 3. Sacrifice of the Mass, §. 160. n. 1. & 177. 4. Invocation of Saints, §. 161. 5. Prayer for the souls of the departed, as betterable thereby in their present condition, §. 162. 6. Communion in one kind, or intinct only, §. 163, 178. 7. A relative Veneration of Images, or Pictures, Ibid. 8. Monastick Vows; and marrying denied the Clergy, after their having taken Holy Orders, §. 164. & 179. n. 1. 9. Auricular or Sacramental Confession, §. 165. 179. n. 2.]

The Replies made hereto, by Protestants, considered, §. 182. &c.

It was affirmed then, above, Chap. 4. §. 26. &c. that the great Points of modern Controversie,

[1. Transubstantiation, or a substantial Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body. (a)

2. Adoration of the Eucharist; i. e. of Christs body, and blood, as present in it; which follows from the former. (b)

3. The Sacrifice of the Mass; not only that of Prayer, Praise, and

§. 82. n. 1.

and *Thanksgiving*; nor only of the *Mysteries* offered, in the consecration of them, as a commemoration of the passion (conceded by Learned Protestants); but also of the very *Body and Blood* of Christ in these *Mysteries*, (which follows from the first point) offered in this service, (as a commemorative, and applicative of the virtue and merit of the same *Body & Blood* offered on the Cross), *pro vivis, & defunctis* (E)

4. *Invocation of the Blessed Virgin and Saints.* (d)

And 3. Such *Prayer for the Dead*, as infers their present condition before the Day of Judgment (whatever their restraint, or sufferings be) conceived betterable by the Intercessions of the living. (4)

Altered, I say, that the 6 Points do clearly appear to have been universally held, and practised, and the approbation and conformity to them imposed by the Ecclesiastical Governours both of the *Eastern* and *Western* Church, at the appearance of *Luther*. Which remains here a little more fully to be vindicated and cleared, first touching these points; and then I shall proceed also to some others.

\$.82. n. 2.

† See Disc.
I. §. 57.

(u) 15. A substantial conversion of the Elements, and corporal presence of our Lords Body and Bloud in the Eucharist, as to the Western Church, was in several Councils defined against *Berengarius* †; and, as to the Eastern Church, the modern Greeks are confuted in this point to agree with the Romanists by learned Protestants:

By D. Potter, p. 225. where, affirming a difference between the Roman Opinion, and that of the rest of the Catholick Church, as to many other points; yet this particular he excepts from them in this manner: — *Unfelicquity* (saith he) *the opinion of Transubstantiation may be escaped, whereas the latter Greeks seem to agree with the Romanists*, quoting there these their Authors for it; *Nicetas Theaur. Græc.* — *Euthym. Zonapla.* — *Hierem. Patriarch. C. P. in Respons. 1. & 2. ad Lutheranos.* — *Nicod. Episcop. Methon.* — *Respons. Græc. ad Card. Guis.*

* By Bishop Forbes, de Enchar. l. i. c. 3. p. 412.—Pater (saith he): *ex Græcæ recentioribus (no aliena ante antiquiores omittam) Niceta thesauro Orithed.—Nicolaus Cabasilus.—Adrianus 6. p. 158.— & Beffardius, qui omnes in suis opusculis apertissime Transubstantiationem confitentur.* Et in *Concilio Florentino non fuit questio inter Græcos, & Latinos (ut Reusninus, aliqui nostri Protestantes, affirmant) an panis substantialiter in Corpore Christi transmutetur, sed quibusnam verbis illa ineffabilis unio fieret; ex solis*

verbis Domini, an vero etiam Sacerdotis, & Ecclesia oratione.

* By Sands West Rel. p. 235. and others.

* And by D. Blondel || the latter Greek Church is confessed to follow the Doctrine of the Second *Nicene* Council; and again, this Council to follow the Doctrine of *Damascen*: His words are, — *The second Council of Nice having honoured this Author [Damascene] with great commendations, and followed him in that wherein he was weakest, and least praise-worthy, hath imposed a tacit law upon the Greeks of latter ages; who have even to our present times so far revered its Decrees, as to speak after its mode, and to desert the stile of more venerable Antiquity, in the imitation of its failings. From thence it proceeds, that the pretended Samonas Bishop of Gaza, Theophylact, Euthymius, Zigabenus, Nicolas Cabasilas, Nicolas Methonensis, Nicetas Pectoratus, John Zonaras, Theodore Balsamon, Marcus Ephesus, and so touch on our own times, Jeremy Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Greeks of Venice, use manners of expressing themselves very incommode, and such as can declare neither the sentiments of modern Rome, nor that of the Fathers of the first Ages. Thus He. Where, having candidly resolved the doctrine of the present Greek Church into that of Damascen, he seeks to relieve himself in contesting Damascens opinion, as also that of Paschasius, whom he joyns with him †, † See Blond. Ib. p. 436, 437* not to signify Transubstantiation, but, from some simile of theirs (though not necessary in every thing to be exactly parallel'd) and some expressions of the Divinity of Christ its filling, or assuming, or infusing it self into the Bread, to infer a certain *hypostatical Impanation*. But this he doth both untruly, and to little purpose: For 1st. such expressions may well be interpreted, as they were by the Cardinal long ago || — That the Divinity of Christ is said *repleat, assumat, infundere se pani, non ut hypostatice sibi conjungat; sed ut omnipotentia sua in carnem suam panem convertat.* And 2^{ly} It appears by many expressions †, that *Damascen*, and so *Paschasius*, not only affirmed the Bread to be by the Divinity of Christ assumed and changed into his Body, but into that very Body that was born of the Blessed Virgin, and that suffered on the Cross; so that it is *Corpus carneum*, not *panaceum* into which the change is made. Of which Body also they affirmed, that it suffers no digestion, corruption, &c. a thing not consistible with the substance of Bread remaining. But see this matter explained much more fully in *Considerations on the Council of Trent*, §. 321. n. 16. &c. against *Claude*. 3^{ly}. Granting *Damascen* and the *Greeks* opinion such as *Blondel* would have it, it follows only, that the Doctrine of the Greek Church touching the Eucharist is much more gross and incredible,

|| *Eclaircis.
sur l' Euchar.
P. 399.*

|| *Bellarmin. de
Euchar. 3. l.
15. c.*

† *See Damasc.
de Orthodoxa
fide 4. l. 14. c.*

credible, and more removed from the Protestant Doctrine, than the Roman is.

After these Testimonies of Protestants, the same expressions found in the Greek Liturgies in the Consecration of the Eucharist (which expressions the Protestants thought fit to change, when they changed their opinion), the like Adoration and Oblation of these Mysteries for the living and the dead, used in the Greek, as well as Latine, Service ; as also this, that there hath been no controversie between these two Churches, as touching this matter, do sufficiently evidence a concurrence of their doctrine herein.

If you desire, after this, to descend to a more particular examination of the Greek Authors fore-mentioned concerning this matter, you may finde a Collection made of several of them by *Johannes a Sancto Andria* annexed to *Garetius* his *Consensus Ecclesie Catholicae de Veritate Corporis Christi in Eucharistia*. And upon the late debate on this Subject that hath hapned in *Francia* between *Monsieur Arnauld* a *Sorbon* Doctor, and *Monsieur Nouet* a Jesuite on the one side, and *Monsieur Claude* a French Minister on the other, you have these Authours and Liturgies diligently quoted and discussed by *Monsieur Nouet de la Presence de Jesu Christ dans le vrai-Sainct Sacrement*, l. 4. c. 2. &c. and by *Monsieur Arnauld* in his first Reply to *Claude*, l. 2. & 3. To which Authors also are added in *Monsieur Arnauld* two Replis to *Claude* (in both which most profitably for the Reduction of stragling Sects to the profession of the Catholick Faith, he makes the clearing of the consent of the Greek and other Eastern Churches, in this point and so occasionally in many others also, with the *Roman*, his chief designe) many evident and irrefragable Testimonies, obtained by the Agents of Princes resident in those parts, from many eminent Prelates and other Persons, and also Synods of the present Eastern Churches ; yet these such, as hold and justify all those opinions in which the present Greek Church hath been known to oppose the Roman : Which Testimonies, as to this and some other controversies, declare them perfectly agreeing with the Doctrine of the Roman Church, as well as with the former Greek Authors, who have heretofore published the Grecian doctrine in their writings ; and clearly opposite to the Protestant.

Those I here especially recommend to your observation in the former of his Replies are these : The Testimonies of the two Synods held at *Constantinople*, the one by *Cyril ab Iherus* A. D. 1559. wherein were present the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and

Jerusalem,

Jerusalem, and the Bishops; the other held by *Adoldorin* his Successor 1642. wherein were present 24 Bishops and amongst them the Metropolitan of *Adassus*. Mention is made of these two Synods, and the Copies of them said to be in the Archives of the Church of *Constantinople*, by *Artemidius* living there at this time, and pretending to the sight of the Patriarch's the 1608. (though dispossessed by one *Demetrius*, who by the Grand Signior's favour now possesseth the Chair) in a Testimony of the Faith of the Orthodox Greeks given by him at the request of the French Ambassador of which see *M. Armand's* last Reply to *Chambers* p. 171. And the last of these Synods that under *Patriarch* was printed in *Moldavia* in *Dessin* 1642 by the procurement of the Legates from the Church of *Constantinople* and of *Russia*, meeting there for a consultation about Ecclesiastical affairs, as appears by their Letter of thanks to the Prince of *Moldavia* joined to the Synod, of which see *Ibid.* p. 183. Sec. These two Synods were occasioned by the former Patriarch *Cyrl* *Lucar* his Confession of Faith favouring Calvinism in several points, and published by him about ten years before, not as his own but as the doctrine of the Greek Church. In the former of these Synods the 6th Anathema, against the 17th Article of that *Cyrl* concerning the Eucharist runs thus, —Anathema to *Cyrl*, who teacheth and believeth that the Bread that is offered, and the Wine also are not changed by the Benediction of the Priest and Operation of the Holy Spirit into the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; since it is delivered in the 17th of his Heretical Articles; that that which we see, and which we receive is not the Body of Jesus Christ. —And the 3d Anathema, against his excluding Saints Intercessions thus: —Anathema to *Cyrl*, who believeth and who teacheth, though obscurely &c. that the Saints are not our Mediators & our Intercessors with God in his saying, that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator and that he only hath the care of the Church. And the 8th Anathema concerning our Prayers benefiting the faithful deceased, against *Cyrl* 18th Article thus: —Anathema to *Cyrl*, who teacheth and who believeth, though in obscure expressions, that those who are deceased find no assistance from the prayers of the Church, but only from the prayers of the Holy Images. —And the 9th thus, against his opposing and endeavouring to suppress the Relative Honour of Holy Images: —Anathema to *Cyrl*, the Schismatic, who rejecteth the relative honour of the Holy Images, and hath endeavoured to suppress it, though it could not be. The 2d Anathema for Church Schism, against his 1st Article, *Excommunicatio* in *extrema* parte, thus, —Anathema to *Cyrl*, who rejecteth the relative honour of the Holy

Church of Jesus Christ can lie. The 4th & 5th Anathemas's proceed against his denying Eretwill, and Seven Sacraments; and allowing only two, Baptism, and the Lords Supper. Again, the 2d of these Synods anathematizeth him upon the same account, and declares his Confession Calvinistical, and not that of the Greeks; excommunicating all such as shall by word or writings defend it.

See also *Cariophilus Archiepiscopus Cogniensis* writing against the same Confession of Cyril, as the doctrine of the Calvinists, and quoting for Transubstantiation, besides the Fathers, several passages in the Greek Liturgies of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom cited at large by *Nouet* l. 4. c. 2. p. 253. &c.

Next see in *Arnould* l. 12. p. 59. the Treatise of *Nicolas Spadarius* a learned and much experienced Noble Moldavian written at the request of the French Ambassador at Stockholm, A. D. 1667, wherein he declares the doctrine of the Greek Church both concerning Transubstantiation, and several other Controversies, in opposition both to Cyril's late Calvinist Confession, and the former Lutheran addresses to *Jeremy* the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, on this manner, (to give you some of his words) — *Orientalis Ecclesia de primo puncto sic statuit — Credimus panem & vinum per verba Domini substantialiter & vere mutari ac transubstantiari in Corpus & Sanguinem, id est ut post consecrationem non maneat substantia panis et vini, sed loco ipsorum Corpus & Sanguis Christi per divinam operationem & voluntatem succedat, &c. — Credimus Christi corpus & sanguinem in Divina Liturgia omnimodo laeuitate adorandum cultumque interno, quam externo. — Credimus oblationem mysterii esse verissimam ac proprium Sacrificium Novi Testamenti quo propitiatur Deus & vivus & mortuus. — A little after which he saith, Omnes Orientalis Ecclesiae filii non solum Græci, verum etiam Russi, Moscovitæ, Moldavi, Vallachi, Georgiani, Mingreli, Circassii, Arabes, & sexcenti alii (licet Russi aliæque gentes Græco non utantur idiomate) uno ore omnes firmiter credunt mysterium hoc esse corpus & sanguinem Domini, atque illud, utpote corpus & sanguinem Domini, summa recipiunt reverentia.*

Touching several other points he goes on — *Monachalem vitam, Angelico parem, Iohannes Baptistæ Prædicatoris in eremo tenuissimæ vivens consecratio — quem quidam viri sancti, Antiochus, Basilus, &c. magno studio coluerunt. — Nunc in sancta monachæ Aethiæ ad undecim Religiosorum millia soli se Deo mancipaverunt. Illi, vero, qui hoc negant, Ecclesia damnet et excommunicet. — Ecclesia Orientalis sanctissimum Dei Matrem invocat, sacra Christi imaginis adorat. — Honoramus etiam Sanctos qui invocantur in quibus periculum est, ut quædam divi quædamque celebra-*

non, proposita igitur imaginibus quarum bene ad Prototypum refer-
tur. Ignorant Historiam Ecclesiasticam, ac innuenerunt munda, qui
Sanctos nolunt invocare. Denique & pro morem Ecclesia Orien-
talis semper erat Deo supplicare in Divinis Mysteriis. Accendit can-
delas & oleum ad sepultura Christianorum; pro quibus etiam elemosy-
nas ac largitas offert; recitque post tertium, nonum, & quadrage-
simum diem, ac tandem post festum, & annuam, eorum memoriam.
Articulos jam dictos ita tenet Ecclesia Orientalis ut nomen de his du-
bium esse queat. Habemus alias cum Occidentali Ecclesia similitudines,
Sic.

To this may be added the Testimony of Poyssin *Ligeridius*
Archbishop of *Uzès*, in a Treatise written by him A. D. 1666.
at the solicitation of the Swedish Resident *Luthers* in *Moscow*.
He is a Greek by Nation; of the Order of *S. Basil*, sent for by the
Great Duke of *Moscow* from the faroe spread abroad of his Learn-
ing, and now residing in his Court. See this Treatise in *Arnau* d
l. 12 p. 60. In which, occur these expressions. *Ecce enim aqua*
credimus in Aletri panem & vinum per arcanam quandam atque omni
sermone facultatem præstantem, in Corpus Christi & Sanguinem
verissime commutari utatibusque, &c. *ignam admodum Sancti Pa-*
tris Orientalis Ecclesie legi essent. Again, after defending the
use of the New word *transsubstantiation*, he goes on. *His manifesta*
constat nullatenus nos admittere Impugnationem Emancipantem the Eucha-
ran way Jandiam & prædicatam in hoc serget nostro sancto detinuit
modo: neque similiter amplectimur figuram symbolica, ac typicam
representationem [meaning the Calvinist way] sed potius Troit
substantiationem unanimiter tam Græci, quam Latini facimus. Nema
ignitur gravetur tenere ac credere quod credunt firmiter, conenque
communiter Hispanie, Gallie, Pannonie, Sarmathie, Sautomathie,
Germani, Aethiopes, quæ vivunt salu esse consensu multum prævalde
maximeque præponderat ceteris. And after speaking of *Cyril* Con-
fession of faith he answers first. *quæque est, quæ abrogam in*
justmodi professionem fides existisse Cyrilli. 2ly. *Dico, sed non*
concesso, quod eius fuerit. Unum esse carnam vulum; & hanc
istum miteri fecimus esse Prothetam illum Iudæ. &c.

Next, see *ibid* p. 55, the Testimony of some Greek Clergy
of the Patriarchate of *Antioch* (the first of which Subscribers is
the *Nephynus magnus Vicarius Patriarchæ Mæcedonensis*;
echeni), being asked their opinion concerning the Eucharist and
some other points, by the French Consul then at *Aleppo*, A. D. 1668.
where they say of the Eucharist. *Devenus profecto*
habetur Eucharistia Sacramentum esse verum Corpus & Sanguis
Christi, &c. *hæc per arcanam & mysticam operationem*

of the Eucharist by collecting his testimony, and again, p. 8. the
 Testimony of some other Antient Bishops and Preachers, and at
 Aleppo, printed in D. 1688. In both which is affirmed such a
 presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist — *Quoniam sic
 unquam Patres Patrum, et Doctorum Christi Body therein*
verba sunt istiusmodi — the Eucharist a Sacrifice offered
 pro peccatis — *pro peccatis tantummodo quam unquam in fine* — In-
 vocation of Saints, Transubstantiation of Images; Non-Resurrection; and
 other such like monstrous notions; and those, who affirm the con-
 trary to these, as also who deny — *substantia in fine* — oblationis
 et operis in fine — *pro peccatis tantummodo* — *et per
 gratiam penitus remissionem*, condemned. These in
 Mr. H. H. former Reply. For the vindication also of which
 Testimonies from Mr. Clarke's aspersions, I refer you to his last
 Reply, where also they are accompanied and confirmed with ma-
 ny more.

Amongst these are, || 1. A Catechism made by a prime || *Armenians*
 Officer in the Church of Constantinople, recited there by those to last Reply,
 whom was depicted the vestment of bread, though this in Cyril l. 4. c. 9.
 later time, and dedicated to all the Bishops and Clergy of the p. 128.
 Oriental Churches, Printed at Paris, 1655. Naming and deter-
 mining expressly for Transubstantiation, and the remaining after
 Consecration of only the Accidents of Bread and Wine; main-
 taining also the same Body in many places at once.

2. A Confession of the Faith from the Orthodox Oriental
 Church, with the approbation and authorizing before it of the
 four Patriarchs, and other chief Bishops of the Oriental Church,
 dated A. D. 1643. the year after the Second Synod held at Con-
 stantinople under Parthenius mentioned before (which Parthenius
 and several other Bishops that signed that Council approved this
 Confession); and so passed abroad in Russia not till 1652.
 then Printed (as it is gathered by the Letter in the Preface, with
 an Epistle before it of the Patriarch of Jerusalem of the same
 date; containing in it all the differences between the Greek and
 Roman Church, which shows, the Authors have no affection for
 the Church of Rome. But containing also this — *That after the
 words of the Invocation of the holy Spirit immediately is made pronoun-
 [that is their word] a Transubstantiation, and the Bread changed
 into the true Body of Jesus Christ, and the Wine into his Blood; the
 appearances of bread and wine by the Divine Oeconomy still remaining.*
*And — that the bread we use is similar to those terrible Mysteries
 which are the same as Jesus Christ himself. It is the same bread
 offered in Sacrifice for all Christian Christians, whether living or*
dead,

death, in hope of the Resurrection to Life eternal; and that it is propitiatory with God for the sins of the Living and the Dead.

The Declaration of Methodius mentioned before, the dispossessed Patriarch of Constantinople, who, requested by the French Ambassadour, delivered to him a Confession of the Faith of the Greek Church, containing for the Eucharist the same things as are in the precedent of the Orthodox Oriental Church, only not naming the word *verbum*; and adding several other things, That the Church Catholick shall always subsist visible and infallible; that it hath power to ordain Fasts and distinction of Meats; that Praying to the Blessed Virgin the Mother of God, and to the Saints in Heaven, diminish nothing of the Honour of Jesus Christ; that a religious cult is due to the Images of Saints; That the Books of Tobie, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the Maccabees, are part of the Holy Scripture.

|| Ibid. c. 18. p.

285.

4. The Declaration of the Patriarch of the Armenians ||: which Armenians holding only one nature in Christ, supposed by him the Divinity, Mr. Claude contendeth, that therefore they deny a Corporal presence in the Eucharist. (of which See Considerations on the Council of Trent, §. 321. n. 8. p. 294.) Which Patriarch happening to be then at Constantinople, was consulted in this matter by the French Ambassadour, and in this Declaration signed by himself and some other Armenian Bishops & Clergy with him, condemns nineteen Calvinistical Articles proposed to him, several of them such as are mentioned in the Declaration of Methodius, and speaks thus in particular of the Corporal Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, — Although (saith he) we believe there is but one Nature in Jesus Christ [i.e. after the Conjunction and Union of our Lords Humanity and Divinity; these Eastern Christians not well distinguishing between Nature and Personality] nevertheless it follows not here, that the Humanity is destroyed, and that Jesus Christ hath no Body. But we believe, that the same Body of Jesus Christ that was crucified, that is ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, is present really, though invisibly in the Eucharist, under the species and extrinsec appearances of the bread and wine, which only remain; because the bread and wine are so changed into the true Body and true Blood of Jesus Christ, that the substance of them remains no more, but only the accidents. And for this we adore also Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. This is the Doctrine of our Church Catholick, this the foundation of our joy and glory, &c.

5. And lastly, the Declaration of a Nestorian Metropolitane signed by himself and several of his Clergy, concurring with these fore-cited. For the Collection of all these we are oblig'd

gca

ged to the prudent Industry of Mr. Arnauld, there seem-
ing scarce any other motive more effective, for rendering a
Protestant disgusted with his own singularity, and for reducing
him to the Universal Faith. In the Author you may see the Dis-
courses encre, and related with many more considerable circum-
stances, I also thought fit to give you these Testimonies, and the
Contents of them, rather all together and unmingled, though
they are as applicable to several of the other points that follow,
as to this of the Corporal Presence, which I am now speaking
of.

Concerning the 24 point [Adoration of Christs Body
and Blood as present in the Eucharist] a necessary consequent of
the first, we roade in the present form of the Greek Mass, that the
Priest, after Consecration, and before he takes the Holy Bread
to communicate himself with it, adores, and saith — *Memento*
Domine Jesu Christe de sancto habuaculo tuo: veni ad sanctificandum
nos, qui in excelsis cum Patre simul sedes, et hic una nobiscum in-
visibiliter versaris; & dignare potius manum tuam nobis imperitum roma-
nam Corpus tuum & pretiosum Sanguinem; & per nos toti populo.
Corpus tuum. I add, never severed from thy Divinity and thy self.
To whom also the Priest had said before in the beginning of the
Service — *Te adores, qui offeris, & offeris, assumis & distribu-*
ris, Christe Deus pater. Then the Priest adores again, and saith
thrice to himself, — *Deus propitius esto mihi Peccatori;* an act of
Humiliation used here by him, before he takes the *Sancta* into his
hands for the Communion; as it was once before, at the beginning
of the Oblation. And so, saith the Rubrick, all the People adore
with him. — *Populus simpliciter sanctus cum devotione adorat.* Then
he takes the Holy Bread, and makes the Elevation of it, yet whole
and entire, saying *Sancta Sanctus.* And the Quire answers with
relation to It, yet one and entire — *Unus Sanctus, unus Dominus,*
Jesus Christus. Then the Priest breaking it into four pieces saith
— *Frangitur Dominus Deus, qui frangitur ac populo communicatur; qui*
semper comeditur & non consumitur; [which shews, what *Agnus*
Dei, whether this in Heaven, or present here, is now spoken of,
and thus adored] *Sed eos qui sunt participes sanctificat.* So taking a
piece thereof in his hand, preparing himself to receive it, he saith
Credo Domine & Confiteor. Quod Tu es Christus. — *Dignare in*
presepse anima mea adire & in coquina tuum Corpus inere-
di. — *& dignare me participem esse sanctissimi tui Corporis & San-*
guinis. I add, never severed from thy Divinity and thy self. I
Also, when he calls the Deacon to Communicate him with the

Holy Bread, it is said—*Accedens Diaconus rostrum exhibet.* And so also, before receiving the Chalice, it is said again; *Diaconus venit & adorans [sic] dicens: Ecce venio ad immortalem Regem, &c.* [Where it must be remembered, that the Greeks also hold the Body of our Lord that is received in the Eucharist to be immortal and incorruptible]. This we find in the Liturgy.

And suitable to this, we read in *Cabasilas* (expounding the Liturgy) concerning the People before their communicating—*Ipsi autem* (saith he) *fidem attendentes & adorant, & venerant, & Jesum qui in eis [donis sanctificatis] intelligitur, [opposed to wisdom.] ut Deum, celebrant.* Where a Protestant † notes, that—*Non adorant dona, sed Jesum.* But who saith, that a

Claude Re-
ply to La-
nauld l. 3.
c. 7. p. 222.

Sovereign Adoration is due or given to the *donis*? Again, *Jesum* (saith he) *qui intelligitur, i. e. only, qui representatur in donis.* But all the former expressions, implying our Lords Presence, shew their belief to be contrary. *Tu es,* (saith the Priest before) *qui offeris, & offeris: assumpsit, & distribuens, Christe Deus noster.* And the People, after this adoring, in their receiving, say:—*Benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini;* of which the same *Cabasilas*—*Tandem enim ad vos venientem, & apparentem, Christum benedicunt.* Who also before (c. 24.) intimates the custome of the Greeks, in the Service *adorare, & alloqui Corpus & Sanguinem Domini.* Now I say, all these Passages in the Greek Liturgy well considered, Here for one to grant, the Real and Corporal Presence of our Lord in his whole Person in the Holy Mysteries to be believed by this Priest, Deacon, and other Communicants, and yet to say, their Adoration, and other addresses and allocutions are not given and made to him, as there present, but to him only as in Heaven, or only to his Divinity, as there, and every where present, abstracted from his Humanity; or to his Humanity also joined to it; but to this only as in Heaven, is such a Comment upon this Liturgy, as nothing but a strong pre-engagement can force upon any ones judgment, unless he will say, that the Worship of the Greeks hath not the same nature, as their Faith; and that they do not allow the Adoration so far, as they believe the Presence.

As for the Greeks accused by some Latines for Non-adoration and other want of Devotion or irreverence toward the Eucharist. The same persons that censure such neglect toward the Holy Mysteries, after consecrated, accuse them almost of committing Idolatry toward them before. So that it seems rather some defect of knowledge, in such, concerning the Ceremonies of Consecration, than want of Devotion. *Cabasilas, (c. 24.)* long ago,

ago, observed the same in some ignorant people, and blamed it; but yet in the same place, allows the adorations of, and allocutions made to, the Body and Blood of our Lord when the Offerings are sacrificed, and perfected. The Consecration also of the Graces being longer extended, and the Adoration not so unitedly performed presently upon the pronouncing of our Lords words of Institution, as amongst the *Latins*; but, disjunctively, at their communicating, might occasion some mistake in those *Lutins*, who accuse them of a *Neglect* Adoration. But, whatever such neglect there may be in the practice of some, we see it is not justified by any; nor countenanced at all in their publick Liturgies, which use as much Ceremony towards the Holy Mysteries, as the *Roman* do. Where also, first, the remains of the Holy Bread are carefully put into the Chalice, for the people to be communicated therewith; and then, for the remains, after the Communion consumed; — *Sacerdos* (saith the Rubrick) *quod residuum est Communionis in Sancti Calice, cum attentione, & devotione consumit; & ter sanctum Calicem abluat, & ascendat, ut remaneat particula, Margarita vocata: [not the least crum of the ininist Host].* Meanwhile we find this their Adoration freely acknowledged by Bishop Forbes de Eucharistia, p. 442. — That *Gracii veneris viventes, & reliqui etiam Gracii omnes adorant Christum in Eucharistia; & quis ausus (saith he) omnis hos Christianos idolatria excusare, & damnare?*

(c) Concerning the third, The Sacrifice of the Mass offered *pro vivis & defunctis*, See the solemn performance thereof in the modern Canon of the Greek Mass, as fully, and much what with the like expressions, as in the Roman; for the excluding of which expressions this Canon suffered so great an alteration at the beginning of the Reformation. — There we read, in the Mass of *S. Chrysostom* — *Tua es tibi tibi offerimus per omnia, & in omnibus Offerimus tibi rationale hunc, & incensum cibum* [ART. 10.] *in confectando, & offerenda hanc propitiationis hostiam;* (See *Cyrril. Hierosol. Cases. Mystag.* c. 9. commenting on the Canon of the Mass) *Et supplicamus, quia Spiritum Sanctum suum in nos, & in hac dona propitius.* — *Offerimus tibi rationale hoc obsequium pro his qui in fide requiescunt, pro Majoribus, Rectibus, Patriarchis, &c.* [i.e. ut illis proficiat ad honorem] — *pro requia, & remissione animarum servorum tuorum in hoc lucida, &c.* [ut illis proficiat ad salutem] — *pro sancta Catholica, & Apostolica Ecclesia, &c.* — Again — *Ut oleum, Deum nostrum, qui oblata, & sanctificat a pretiosa Dona in sanctum, & supercalestis intellectuale suum altare suscipis in odorem spiritualis*

§. 82. n. 4.

suavissimis, nobis divinam gratiam, & sanctissimi spiritus donum repen-
dit. Dominum precemur. And in the Mass of S. Basil—*Memem-
or Domini altissimi, qui tibi hæc dona oblatum, & pro quibus, & per
quos, & propter hæc oblatum.* And after ward—*Tu Deus
noster, qui hæc dona suscepisti, purga nos ab omni inquinamento carnis,
& spiritus, ut patet quidem testimonio conscientia nostra suscipientes
peram agimus, & sacrificiorum tuorum.* I filed also there
veneranda, supercunctis, illibata, invisibilia, mysteria. I uniamur sancto
Corpori, & sanguini Christi. And indeed; Learned Protest-
tants together with the whole Greek and Latine Church, granting
the Eucharist to be the Christian or Evangelical Sacrifice, not only
in respect of the action, in it, of Praise and Thanksgiving, but also
in respect of the Oblation to God of the mysteries in the Consecrat-
ion, as a commemorative, or Representative, of the Body and Blood
of Christ offered on the Cross; And next, the Grecian Church
being once conceded to agree with the Western in the Doctrine of
Transubstantiation, or corporal presence, (see before §. 82. n. 2.) ;
it necessarily follows, that the Greek Church doth, together with
the Western, hold an Oblation made to God in the Eucharist of
that very Body and Blood of Christ; i. e. do maintain the Sacrifice
of the Mass, &c. &c.

† Mede
Chri. Sacr.

P. 525. 475.

--B. Bramb.

Reply to

Chalced. c. 9.

P. 371. 372.

--Thorndik.

Epilog. 1. 3. c.

5. p. 46. & c.

§. 82. n. 5.

(d) Concerning the fourth, Invocation of the Blessed
Virgin and Saints, — *Multis jam seculis* (saith Bishop Forbes
de Invocatione Sanctorum, p. 321.) *in universa Ecclesia, in Oriente
non minus quam in Occidente, etiam in Aquilone apud Muscovitas,
Litania est decantata; ut pulchra, Sancto Petro ora pro nobis.* And see
in the *Officium Exequiarum* (apud Goar. p. 325, 328.) — *Quæ solâ
para, & illibata a virgo Deum absque semine peperisti, intercede, ut
ejus anima salvetur.* — *per te vitam invenit hominum Genus; per te
paradisus recuperamus.* And — *Agri Dei præcones, & velut oves ma-
dant, sancti Martyres huic officio expofcres, simulque nobis, debitorum
remissionem donaturi.* In the Office in time of pestilence (Goar. p. 793.
795.) — *Æthiopiæ, & continuis dolibus percussis, tibi, virgo,
sanctæ precidimus: potius tua protectione omnes salvi, Opera; mis-
ere, Dei sponsa, ab hac perniciæ, & morbo gravi nos præserva, & in-
firmis acribus medere, O Domina.* And — *Agrestium morbi angus-
tias, apostoli, Jesum Dominum, & servorum præsentem, nos edu-
ciet.* — *Adhærentium, facti Doctores, &c. ex totorum dolores, ves-
tris intercessionibus mitigare, & saltem conferre.* [Some of these
too in as high expressions, you see, as those found in the Roman
Church. But if we will permit (which is all reason) those, who
use such words to expound their meaning, they understand only by
them,

them, the Blessed Virgin & Saint's procuring of God by their intercessions those favours, and mercies, which they ask of them † † See Bell. de
nor are these Saints apprehended to preserve, or save people any sanct. Beat.
otherwise, than S. Paul did, 1 Cor. 9. 22. See Jeremy the Con- l. i. c. 17.
Constantinopolitan Patriarch in his first answer to the Lutheran Di- † p. 128.
vines † — *Ad Dominam nostram, & ad sanctos exclamamus* — Per † See Dr.
sancta Domina Despar pro nobis intercede peccatoribus: Omnes sancti Stillin. Rat.
Angeli, Apostoli, &c. & faminarum sanctarum coetus, orate pro Acc. p. 502.
nobis. That Exposition, therefore, of this Patriarch (which some || Hierem.
† make use of to persuade the credulous, as if the Grecian in the p. 127.
Doctrine of Invocation differed from the Roman, Church); i.e.
[*Invocatio que ad Sanctos fit non proprie Invocatio est; sed per accidens*
(sic dicendo) & per gratiam. Non enim Petrus aut Paulus [i.e. vir-
tute naturali] exaudiunt invocatores suos sed illa gratia, quam habent;
secundum illud quod Dominus dixit: *Ero vobiscum usque ad consum-*
mationem], is not thus to be understood; that none of these Saints
hear, or at least by some other way know, mens prayers, (though
the Cardinal Bellarmine observes †, neither thus could Saint invo- † De sancto-
cation be vain, if others at the least for them heard, and granted rum beati-
their supplicants requests); for the same Patriarch's saying after- tudine, l. i.
ward (p. 243.) that it may be many ways shewed, that the Saints c. 20.
invoked, do help and relieve, doth presuppose also, that they
know, mens necessities; and therefore the Lutheran Divines in
their Reply endeavour to prove this against him, among other
things, that Saints hear not mens prayers: But he mbanath only;
that they hear them not *suis viribus naturalibus*, but *per supernatu-*
ralem gratiam Dei, as he explains himself also in his second an-
swer, p. 245. — *Sanctos multum posse; cum per gratiam sint Dei*
(inquit enim Psalmorum author: *Deus stetit in Synagoga deorum;*
dignitates scilicet distribuens, ut interpretatur divus Gregorius) —
And — *In sua vita plenos fuisse Spiritus sancti; & post funera*
ipsorum, ejusdem Spiritus gratiam non excessisse ex ipsis &c.

(c) Concerning the fifth Point, Prayer for the Dead: The §. 82. m. 6.
Prayers of the Greek Church for the deceased are not only made
for remission of sin at the day of judgment, for a happy resurrec-
tion at that time, glory, life eternal, in the Kingdom of Heaven,
&c. with relation to the person of the defunct; but also for pre-
sente mission, rest, light, peace, refreshment, *cum spiritibus jus-*
torum consummati, in sinu Abrahe, in Paradiso, in loco refrigerii; † Hierem.
& *lucis, unde dolor, & arumna, & suspirium exulant, &c.* for the Patri-
archs of the defunct before the day of Judgment: viz. of such de-
funct (to use the Patriarch's expression †), *Qui, inter penitendum* c. 21.
preventi.

presenti mundo fuerit; mundum autem perducunt in mundum eternum, in-
 trant; for rest, and refreshment for them; in fine mundi, &c.
 i. e. in the present celestial region of happy souls, imagined su-
 perior to that, they shall inhabit after the day of Judgment. So
 in the modern Greek Mass it is said—Offerimus tibi, &c. pro
 requie, & remissionis animæ servi tui N. in loco lucido, a quo abest
 dolor & gemitus—And—Fac eam quiescere, ubi circumspicitur tu-
 men vultus tui. And in their Officium exequiarum (apud Goar. p.
 525)—Cum spiritibus iustis consummatis animæ servi tui saluator
 da requiem, & in vitam æternam, qua a te est, custodi illam benigne.
 In quietis loco, quo sancti tui cuncti resident, animam servi tui com-
 pone Domine, quia tu solus es clementer. Tu Deus es, qui in infernum
 descendisti, & compeditorum arumnas solvisti; ipsa & anima servi
 tui da requiem.

See the Decree also concerning Purgatory, Conc.
 Florent. Sess. 25. subscribed by the Greeks—Si vere penitentes in
 Dei charitate decesserint, antequam dignis penitentia fructibus de-
 compensati & omnis satisfecerint; eorum animas panis purgatoris post
 mortem purgare; & ut a panis huiusmodi redeantur, prodesse his vivo-
 rum fideliū suffragia, &c. From which decree it doth not appear,
 from Marcus Ephesus his speeches in, or writings after, the
 Council, that he at all dissented; but denyed his subscription to
 the Council only in respect of other articles disallowed by him.

If this subscription satisfy not, See before the Greeks de-
 claration to the Pope of their own opinion in the same Sess. De
 igne vero purgatorio determinatum sit est—Sanctorum animas per-
 fectam in celis adeptas esse certum, quatenus animæ sunt: Peccatorum
 vero animas perfecte lucere potius: medias autem esse in loco tormen-
 torum; sed sine ignis sit suo caligo, ac turbo, sine quid aliud, non con-
 sideramus. If this also be thought to taste of some compliance with
 the Latines; See their declaration in the same Council when they
 newly come thither, before the first solemn Session, conferring
 then with the Latines on this subject; and Marcus Ephesus being
 one of their delegates; where the same Marcus, after the Latines
 had explained their doctrine, pronounced, parum inter nos hac in
 re differre: Then then it runs thus—Græci in futuro tantum saeculo
 [i. e. in or after the day of judgment] poenitentia ignem: penamque
 [i. e. in posthumi saeculo before the day of judgment] animarum
 emporium: Quod scilicet peccatorum [i. e. as they explain them-
 selves elsewhere, eorum] qui in mortis huius peccatis diem extre-
 mum non clausurunt, neque tunc omnino expetere culpæ fuerunt; po-
 nitentia fructus declarant: animæ in locum abeunt maris,
 in quo ad tempus versentur in maris & panis, divino lumine pri-

data per purgatorium vero [not by fire, or any other external instrument cleaning or refining these soules from some inherent sordes, or Relicks of sins, as they understood the Latines to hold, *animas* not only *paci*, but *purgari per ignem*; and Session *ult. animas purgari per orationes*, but] *hoc est* (say they), *a loco illo obscuro, & afflictione liberemur, & absolvamur, precibus & sacrificiis Sacerdotum, ac elemosynis, non autem igne, neque enim grati fassentur actionem ignis, ut Itali; sed operatur tantum oratio, deprecatio, & elemosyna.*

Again In respons: *ad Card. Guis. Q. 10.* they declare themselves—*Eorum hominum anima, quorum quasi media quoddam conditio est, qui scilicet in mortiferis peccatis diem extremum non clausurunt; nec tamen omnino expertes culpa fuerunt, penitentieque fructus declarant, harum inquam anima creduntur a nostris ejus modi delictorum ratione purgati, non per purgatorium aliquem ignem, vel determinata certo quodam loco supplicia (nam id nusquam traditum existat); sed nonnulla in ipso discepta a corpore per solam mentis, ut Gregorius ille cognomento Theologus [Pope Gregory the First] pronunciat; nonnulla post disceptum a corpore, fortassis etiam apud Orcum detenta; non quod in igne supplicio ve sint, sed velut in custodia & vinculis coercantur. His omnibus opitulanti preces eorum nomine factas dicimus, &c.*

Again; In the Greeks Apology to the Council of Basil, they grant from 2 Maccab. 12. 46. & Math. 12. 32. Manifestum cuiusvis esse, remissionem peccatorum nonnullis vita functis concedi, Quoniam vero modo (say they) & *an per punitionem* [i.e. any sensitive or purgative pain, further then *pœna damni, doloris, & privationis divini luminis*, which they willingly grant such soules to suffer, till such sins, by prayers, alms, &c. remitted]: & *quidem illam per ignem, ne meminissent quidem in universum*, [the forecited Texts.] Then against such *Ignis Purgatorius* they thus dispute.—*Porro, quod hac purgatoriam ignem non inferat, sole clarius est. Quid enim commune est remissioni cum purgatione per ignem & punitionem? aut enim punitione, aut remissione, sive condonatione est opus, & non simul utroque.* To which may be added that other passage so frequently quoted by Protestant Writers, *Hæc ob causas nunc etiam propositum dogma de purgatorio igne exterminandum est ab Ecclesia, ut negligentiam secularium animis inducens, ac persuadens ipsis, ne omnibus viribus adstantur, ut in hac vita seipsos expurgent, cum alia post hunc vitam purgatio expectetur.* But here note first; That, supposing that there be no fire or other external instrument purgative, or punitive of Soules after this life; yet thus much the Greeks always maintain, viz. a *pœna damni*; and exclusion from blisse of some faithful soules remaining in some place.

place or other out of Paradise, till their sins by the mercy of God be remitted after some time of such sufferance or suspension; to which remittance also the prayers of the living, made for them, do much conduce; and so when fully purged; i. e. absolved and freed from those sins, they ascend unto the blisses of other souls more perfect in the same Paradise. Now more than this is not determined in the Roman faith. As for that which is urged of such a Punitive purgation hereafter its rendring men more careless here; One would think the Greeks remission of sins after death without such purgation by fire would cause this more, than the Latines, with it.

§. 82. n. 7.

Next; As these *Five Points* were universally held and practised at the coming of *Luther*; so it may seem as clear to any moderate Protestant, that the forenamed Points, together with four more added to them; viz. *Communion in one kind.* *Veneration of sacred Images, and Pictures.* *Monastick vows, and Celibacy of the Clergy;* And *Amicular, or Sacramental Confession of all mortal sin, and the imposition of due penances for them,* are the main points in the Roman Church, that are thought to give just offence, and to have necessitated a Reformation. But in these four last also it may easily be shewed, that the Roman Church stands not alone; but, that these points also are (and were at the appearance of *Luther*) the common practice of the Eastern Churches in such a manner, as Protestants disallow, and oppose.

1st. For *Communion in one kind*; The modern *Greek* also are known to communicate the Ecclesiasticks, and the Laicks after a several manner; for they give the *Clergy* the Symbol of Christ's Body into their hands, after which in their order they suck the Blood of our Lord out of the Chalice standing on the Altar, with a pipe; but they communicate the *people* only with the Symbol of Christ's Body intinct in that of his blood, taken out of the Chalice with a little spoon, and so put into their mouths: Not eating therefore the Body, and drinking the blood of our Lord apart, (as Protestants contend, our Lord not only instituted, but commanded it.) This former way of communicating the People in both kinds having been changed, in both Churches, upon the same ground; namely the many abuses and irreverences which have happened in giving the consecrated bread into their hands, and allowing to many Communicants of all ages, and conditions to drink out of the Chalice. Lastly, they communicate the *Sick* only with the Symbol of Christ's Body, consecrated on *Maundy Thursday*, for all the year following, and then, on that day, be sprinkled with the Symbol

Symbol of his blood; and softened again for the sick with common wine at the time when they administer it †. Such is their practice; † See Goare whilst both East and West, together with the ancient Church, do hold Christ to be totally present, and so also totally exhibited, in any one species. Εὐχολογ. P. 149, 150. S. Chrysost. Mass. See below. §. 170.

2ly. A *Relative Veneration* of the *Cross*, and of *Sacred Images* or at least of *Pictures* (which is the same) is also a known practice of the Greek Church, and a matter defined lawful in the second *Nicean*, entertained by the present Greek Church as the seventh *General Council*.

3ly. As to *Monastick Vows*, and *Celibacy of the Clergy*. 1st. It cannot be denied; but that the Eastern Churches do and have always held lawful, and used, these vows; and abounded with Monasteries, as well as the Western. 2ly. Amongst these vows, hold lawful and use, that of *perpetual Chastity*; which vow is generally taken by the cloistered Religious: and enjoined also to all their Priests, who enter into Orders unmarried; though those, that are married before, are also admitted by them into such Orders: which vow, exacted from all such, argues, that they (agreeably with the *Western Church*, and contrary to the *Reformed*) hold all persons, using a meet endeavour, to be capable of this gift of *Continency*: and then, upon this granted, it can be no injustice in the Roman Church, in order to a greater freedom from secular cares, to exact that from the Clergy, that the Eastern doth from the Monks; and to enjoin only to so many of her Sons, as shall desire her spiritual preferments, that which, it is agreed, all are able to perform.

4ly. For *auricular*, or *Sacramental Confession* to the Priest (held necessary for all great, and mortal sins, by which Christians fall from the grace of their baptism); as also the injunction of meet Penance for them: That these are taught and practised in the Greek, as well as the Roman Church, see *Jeremias* the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, *Resp. l. c. 11.* — *Gabrielis Philadelph. Metropolit. lib. de Sacramento penitent.* — *Simeonis Archiepiscopi Thessalonic.* on the same subject *apud Morinum de Administrat. Sacrament. penitent.* — And *Goar's Euchologion* in the *Orationes super penitentes* p. 678, 679. where also he sets down the *Officium confitentium*; and mentions the several sorts of penances usually prescribed: See also *Eugen. Roger. Recollet. Terre Sancte. l. 2. tract. 4. §. 15.* † *Rosens. 2.* Thus *Jeremias* the Patriarch †, to the *Tubing Divines* affirming, c. 11.

Ut omnia peccata recenscantur; nec per singulas species enumerentur, non esse necessarium. Respondentes dicimus. Eum, qui confuetur, nam deum perfectam peccatorum suorum consequi gratiam, si peccata omnia, omnesque eorum partes, quantum animus illi sufficit, & quantum meminisse potest, cum contrito, & humilissimo corde recensuerit; neque confessus fuerit; feceritque ea omnia, qua maxime illis peccatis, qua infamis, universatur; quod tunc S. Basil. — Omne delictum apud eum, qui propius, referre oportet; malicia nunquam silens rebus; oculus ac sub tunc latens, mirus est.

† Afection.

† c. 12.

† De Confes-

sione l. 4. c. 1.

De Sacra-

ment l. 4. c. 1.

† Sess. ult.

And after, concerning Sacerdotal Absolution; he saith — Neque quonquam absolvimus, nisi prima iustas causas, & castigationes illi pro peccatis admissis inungamus; idque plurimas ob causas. Daille † indeed quotes Arcudius || as saying, that the Greeks; & Russian Bishops, & Priests seldom confessed, & that concerning this matter Pope Eugenius also, in the Council of Florence †, questioned the Greeks — Cur neque Pontifices neque Presbyteri celebrantes peccata sua confiteri solent; from which neglect of it, Daille gathers, they hold no necessity of it. But ist. the neglect of a thing infers not the denial of it to be a duty; and, since the Clergy only are accused of such neglect, why may not Daille rather collect a necessity of auricular confession to have been taught by the Clergy from the constant practice of it by the people, than a non-necessity hold from the neglect of it in the practice of some of the Clergy? Daille himself (Ibid.) makes another comment upon it, saying, that this was not generally neglected by the Priests; but that some of them confessed more frequently; And again; for the delinquents of confession in others gives this reason, not that they allowed what they did; but that many of them being guilty of crimes; for which by the Canons they were liable to be suspended from their functions, chose rather to conceal their faults, & misere impenitentes manere, than to suffer such confusion, and publick shame; especially whenas, confession being necessary only in case of mortal sin; it cannot be required that any confess before he celebrate, or within some short space of time; which confession, because it is not certain that so soon he must fall into such a sin, without which some holy men are thought to have passed a great part of their life; and therefore, though an annual confession is, by the Church, enjoined to all, as being to them some way beneficial; yet it is not so enjoined as to all, for annual mortal sin, is not always necessary. And, some such way, it seems, the Pope in the Council of Florence received satisfaction from the answer of the Greeks; though what it was, is not there set down. Arcudius † imagines some such reply as this returned to him — Mortalia habemus in confitendo; in hisque absolutione; ne-

que

quod dicitur (Epist. de) hanc nostram sententiam Gyreni hanc bene fuisse probatam, con-
suetudinem &c.

Concerning all the precedents, and several other points, that
the full accord of the Greek, with the Roman, beliefs, and pra-
ctice; may be yet more confirmed to you; be pleased to peruse,
more particularly, the three answers of *Jeremias Patriarch C. P.* to
the Lutheran Divines of *Tudung*; who sent unto him their *Augus-
tine* confession, desiring an agreement, and union between the Re-
formed, and the Greek Churches [*no Constantinensi unis. Taking again
Christiana concordia, & charitatis vincula mutuo copulamur, quo ni-
hil optatius contingere nobis possit* †] and that they might the easier † *Abt. Theol.*
obtain their request, telling him that they submitted to the first se- *Wittenberg.*
ven General Councils ||—[*Illam* (say they), *qua a Sanctis Apol-* *Epist. — See*
stolis & Prophetis & Spiritum Sanctum habentibus Patribus ac Patri- *Jerem Pa-*
archis & super Divinas Literas adificatis septem Synodis tradita est, *riarch. Epi-*
fidem amplectentes]. To whom the Patriarch answers—*Responde-* *log. fin.*
bitur ergo. nihil nostrum afferentes: sed ex Sanctis septem Oecumeni- *|| Epist. Theol*
cis Synodis (quas & *Vobis probari recte scribitis*) & *ex sententia* *Tub. & Hic-*
S. Doctorum, &c. where first the Patriarch, going through *rem. Patria.*
all those Articles, declareth the faith of the Greek Church, in *prof. resp. i.*
the most, and most considerable, points, contrary to their, and con-
senting with the Roman, Doctrines. And, they still unsatisfied, and
replying, writes a second answer, in defence of his first, toward the
end of which †, he thus paternally exhorts them—*Scimus itaque,* † *p. 250.*
Frater, in petra fidei, & Traditione Ecclesia; non transferentis
terminos a S. Patribus nostris positos: non daures locum illis, qui va-
buis novis student, & adificium sancta Dei Catholica, & Apostoli-
ca, Ecclesia deicere conantur. Si enim talis licentia cuilibet conce-
datur: paulatim totum Ecclesia corpus destruetur. And, they not
acquiescing, but a third time reassaulting him, and imposing (as he
thought) a sense on the Scriptures contrary to the traditional; and
also borrowing weapons out of the Greek Fathers (as they misap-
plied them) against him, he returns a third answer; in the conclu-
sion of which he thus reprehends them in particular concerning
these points—*Præterea* (saith he) *invocationem sanctorum vanam*
existimatis; & imagines, & venerandasque reliquias, & adora-
tionem vestros. Rejicitis item unumquemque alterius ad alterum [*i. e. ad*
Sacerdotem. See Hierem. Respons. cap. 11.] confessionem; præterea
monitionem vocant, angelis æqualem. And then, disallowing their
interpretation of Scriptures contrary to the meaning of those fathers,
somewhat more provoked the faith—*Cyprianus & Iulianus similes,*
quodammodo ipsi sanctam [divina dicta] sic interpretari faci-
quem-

quemadmodum habemus, ceterique Traditiones tales, cum approbassent ut necessaria, & pia, continua successione per manus veluti tradentes, ad nos usque propagarunt; quarum, aliquas vetus etiam Roma observat, & nobiscum amplectitur. [Aliquas, he saith; for several Points there are, in which the Greeks oppose the Roman Church, wherein the Protestants do side with the Roman against them; but amongst these aliquas, wherein both the Greek, and Roman Church agree against the Protestant, are all the forementioned points, and many more.] Unde igitur vos rectius, & melius veterē novaque Roma sapistis, ut verorum Theologorum scriptis relictis, vestra ista meliora potioraque duceretis? Et schismata, que apud vos sunt, que multi varii-que generis sunt, illa scilicet Lutheranorum, Hebræi atque, ut fama fert, pietatis simulatione introduxerunt, ac disseminaverunt; Et nunc etiam, sicut oculis cernitur, proficiunt in pejus, & quotidie crescunt. Cum quibus equidem nos prorsus non communicantes quicquam, Ecclesia nostra mysteria immota servamus: manentes in iis, que dicta sunt a successoribus præconum Dei Apostolorum — Rogamus itaque vos, ne posthac labores nobis exhibeatis — Nam Theologos, qui Ecclesia luminaria fuerunt, alias aliter tractatis; & verbis quidem honoratis eos; extollitisque; factis vero rejicitis; armaque nostra inutilia nobis efficere vultis, &c. — Quamobrem quantum ad vos attinet, liberaſti nos enris. Vestram ergo viam euntes, ne amplius de dogmatibus, sed amicitie tantum causa, si vuleritis, scribite.

6.83.n.2.

† p. 235.

And much what the same tenents of the Greek Church, as are vindicated by Hieremias, you may find acknowledged by Sir Edwin Sandys in his relation of the West Relig. p. 233. &c. — With Rome (saith he) the Greek Church concurs in the opinion of Transubstantiation; and generally in the Sacrifice, and whole Body of the Mass. And afterwards (p. 238) he saith — For the form and ceremonies thereof they much resemble the Latins: Their Altar they enclose from the people, that the Arcana of those their ineffable crossings, and conversions, may not be prostituted, and polluted by an unsanctified view; whereas the Romans lye fair, and open — They elevate the Host forward, and near the Body of the Church; as the Latines do backward, and at the Altar: And for their Liturgies † he confesseth — That they are the same, that in old time; namely S. Basil's, and S. Chrysostom's and S. Gregory's translated, and these, without any bending of them so that change of language, which their tongue hath also suffered. [where you may observe their Divine Service also to be celebrated in a tongue vulgarly unknown. Of which Brerewood in his Inquiries q. 2. p. 12. gives this account — That the difference is become so great between the present and the ancient Greek, that their Liturgy, yet read in the ancient Greek tongue, namely that of Basil

[the

[the longer] on the Sabbaths, and solemn dayes, and that of Chrysostom [the briefer] on common dayes is not understood (or but little of it) by the vulgar people: And the skilful in the learned Greek cannot understand the vulgar. Thus he for the language: now, for the matter; If you please to peruse this their modern Liturgy, and Church Service, in Goars *Εὐχολόγιον* or *Rituale Græcorum*, *juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesie*, printed at Paris 1647, or in that printed before at Venice 1639. and to compare it with ancienter Copies of S. Basil, and S. Chrysostom's, Missals; and again compare both with the Roman; you shall find them either agreeing; or, where they differ one from another, the Greek as much offensive to Protestants as the Latine Service, so that the Reformation must be confessed to be made against the publick Liturgies both of the Eastern, and Western (i.e.) of the whole Catholick Church. To go on]—They agree (saith he) in praying to Saints; in auricular Confession; in offering of Sacrifice and prayer for the dead; in these without any (or no material) difference. They hold Purgatory not by any outward torment [as he explains himself afterward] but that the soul is not received into glory, till by an extream compunction and anguish of mind they have worn out those stains, with which their sins defiled them. [As for the controverſie between them, and the Western Doctors, whether such suffering be by fire, it is a thing never determined one way or other in any Council], And the worshipping of pictures; kneeling to two; that of Christ and of our Lady; passing over the rest with an ordinary reverence—In sum; they still retain those opinions, which grew into the Church before the separation between the Greeks & the Latines; [which separation was first made about the year 800 but the Protestants condemn many Roman tenents, and practices, from 600. and then common to them with the Greeks]: And all the Ceremonies, which were then common to both they still retain; as their crossings, tapers, with certain others. Thus he.

As for the differences (mentioned by Sandys) between the Greeks, and Latines, in other points; First, I appeal to the judgment of the ingenuous Reader, whether these points, wherein they are acknowledged to agree, be not the chief and the main of those which are debated between the Reformed and Roman Church. Again; many of those, wherein he mentions them to differ, are of small moment; as their using *leaven* in their *Hosts*, which the Latines avoid; their tolerating no *Images* in their Church [when as it is granted before, that they use *Pictures* in the same manner, as the Roman Church doth]: their using no round counters, or beads, for praying by tale: [these being brought up in the West, after the division of those Churches]. Lastly,

§. 83. r. 3.

as for other things that seem of more consequence, wherein this Author makes these two Churches to dissent. See them more fully collected by Dr. Field, in his 3. l. 1. c. and spoken to below §. 85. n. 1. In several of which, indeed, the Roman tenents are mistaken; I mean, the tenents of their Councils, and of their more moderate Doctors. In which tenents if the Greek Churches may be said to agree with the Protestant, so also may these Doctors in the Roman. Concerning some of which I will set you down the late candid concession of Mr. Baxter (no great friend of the Church of Rome), in his Key for Catholics, part. 1. c. 5. — *I am satisfied (saith he) that in many doctrinal points, the difference between us and the Papists, is not so great as commonly is taken to be by many, if not by most on both sides: as in the points of Certainty of salvation, of Pardon, of Justification, of Works, of Faith and in almost all the Controversies about Predestination, and Redemption, Free will, the work of Grace, &c. The Dominicans in sense agree with the Calvinists, (as they call them; and the Jesuits with the Lutherans, and Arminians; and so in divers other points.* How near doth Dr. Holden come to us in the fundamental points of the Resolution of our Faith? How near count the Scotists to us in sense about the point of Merit? And Waldensis, and others, yet nearer? How near comes Contarminus to us in the point of Justification? How near comes Gerson in the point of Venial and Mortal sin? perhaps as near, as we are to our selves. How near come the Dominicans, and Jansenius to us in the points of Predestination, Grace, and Free will? For my own part, I scarce know a Protestant, that my thoughts in these do more concur with, than they do with Jansenius. Thus Baxter concerning some of the Roman Doctors (yet who own the Council of Trent) agreeing with Protestants (or rather moderate Protestants with the Church-Catholic) in those points, wherein Sandys and Field suppose the main difference to be between the Reformed, and the Roman Churches.

§. 83 n. 4.
† View of
Relig. p.
476 A 80.

To this of Sandys may be added the latter collection made by Alexander Rossi out of Boverius, Chytræus, Berrwood, Passavine, Thomas a Jesu, Hieronimus Patrich Constant. Resp. ad German. & Concil. Florent.

The Greeks (saith he) place much of their devotion in the worship of the blessed Virgin Mary; and of painted, but not carved Images; in the intercession, prayers, help, and merits of the Saints; which they invoke in their temples. The Sacrifice of the Mass is used for the quick, and the dead; and they use the Holy Masses. — They do not hold a Purgatory fire; yet they believe there is a third place, between that of the Blessed, and the damned, where they remain, who have deferred repentance till the end of their life.

life. But if this place be not Purgatory, I know not what it is. [saith he] nor what the souls do there. Priests among them may marry: once, but not oftner. [But, p. 496. he saith, that Protestants herein differ from the Greek Church; but the Protestant's permits Priests after Ordination to marry: But the Greek permits not this; but only, that a married man may be admitted into Holy Orders, so he abstain from his wife, when he officiates]. They also leavened bread in the Sacrament, and administer in both kinds.

[But note, that what he saith of the Moscowian, (p. 485.) is also true of the Greek Church; that they give to the people at once both the Body, and Blood of our Lord, mingled in the Chalice, with a spoon; and so to the sick only the Symbol of the bread, consecrated on Maunday Thursday for all the year following, and then, on that day, besprinkled with the other Symbol of the wine; and foshed again for the sick with common wine when they administer it, as hath been already said §. 82. n. 7. (See Goar's Eucherolog. p. 153.) which receiving both species together in a spoon, as it is testified by many Travellers who have been spectators thereof, so it may be collected out of S. Chrysostom's Liturgy, as it is now used by the modern Greeks; where, before communicating the people, it is said—*Tunc accipiem. Diaconus sanctum Discum, super sanctum calicem sancta species diligenter abstergit* [so putting the particle of the Symbol of the bread into the Chalice] & *adorans semel* [where also observe adoration] *sumit sanctum Calicem cum veneratione, & procedit ad ostium, & accollens sanctum Calicem ostendit illum populo, dicens: cum timore Dei, & fide accedite*: and so with a little spoon called by the Greeks *natib* (which you may see described in Goar's Eucherolog. or Rituale Grecorum, p. 152.) takes out a very small particle thereof, and puts it into the mouth of the Communicant.

§. 83. n. 5.

He goes on—*They have four Lenten in the year: They will not have, neither the blessed Souls in heaven, to enjoy Gods presence, nor the wicked in hell to be tormented, till the day of Judgement. They esteem equal with the Scriptures the Acts of the seven Greek Synods and the writings of Basil, Chrysostom, Damascen, and their Traditions. They believe, that the souls of the dead, are bettered by the prayers of the living. They are no less for the Church's authority, and for Traditions, than the Roman Catholicks be. When the Sacrament is carried through the Temple, the people, by bowing themselves, adore it, and falling on their knees, kiss the earth.—They have their Monks, who are all of S. Basil's Order: these have their Archimandrites, or Abbots. The Patriarch, Metropolitans, & Bishops are of this Order, and abstain from flesh; but, in Lent, and other fasting days, they forbear fish,*

§. 83. n. 6.

fish, milk, and eggs. The Greeks celebrate their *Liturgies* in the old Greek tongue, which they scarce understand. On the *Festival* days they use the *Liturgy* of Basil; on other days that of S. Chrysostom. They have no other translation of the Bible, than that of the 70. Lastly, For auricular or Sacramental Confession to the Priest, though he omits it in the Greek, yet he † mentions it as used in the Russian Churches, which follows herein the practice of the Greek.

† p. 485.

Meanwhile, their chief differences from the Church of Rome he makes to be these, 'Their denying the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; 'their denying the Pope's Supremacy; 'their not using, either Confirmation, 'or extreme Unction. But in the first of these, they differ not more from the Roman, than from the Protestant Churches; In the second, not so much from the Roman, as do the Protestant Churches, (of which see below §. 85. n. 1. & 6.) As for the two last Alexander Ross might have found, in one of the chief Au-

† Resp. 1. c. 7

thors (Jeremiah the C. P. Patriarch †) both these Sacraments to be acknowledged by, and used in, the Greek, as well as Latin, Church: Confirmation being conferred by them alwayes immediately after Baptism—*Ad quod, illud dicimus* (saith he) *in ea ipsa orthodoxa Catholica Ecclesia septem divina Sacramenta esset, Baptismum scilicet, Sacri unguentis Unctionem* [or as he styles it afterward, *sacrum Chrisma, sive Confirmationem*] *Sacram Communionem: Ordinem: Matrimonium: Poenitentiam: Et Extreme Unctionis oleum.* (Of which see below §. 85. n. 1. Resp. ad. 9.)

§. 83. n. 7.

For these many differences of the Greek, as well as the Roman, from the Reformed Churches, it is, that Mason, being to prove a case of necessity for the ordaining of Protestant Ministers, beyond Seas only by Presbyters, (in §. 23.) on that subject argues thus—*These Ministers could not receive Ordination from the Popish Churches, because of the abomination of their sacrificing Priesthood, and because these would ordain none, but in a Popish manner to a Popish Priesthood, &c. And neither* (saith he) *by the same reason, could they obtain Ordination from the Greek Church. For Bellarmine denyeth it to be a Church, because they were lawfully convicted in three full Councils of Heresie: and especially of the Heresie about the proceeding of the holy Ghost: which, to be a manifest Heresie* (saith Bellarmine), *with the Lutheran and the Calvinists do confess. Wherefore seeing no Church* (as Mason goes on) *will give Orders but only to such persons as approve their doctrine, therefore they could not with a safe conscience seek to the Greek Church, whose doctrine they justly mistook. And being thus excluded from the Greek, and the Latine, from the East, and the West* [no Bishops being as yet turned Protestants to ordain] *what should be done? It was the duty of the Magis-*

ought not to suffer false Prophets, and to plant costly Preachers in their places. But whence should they have them? The Bishops were so full from yielding Ordination in any tolerable manner, that they persecuted such, as sought the Reformation. Whosoever is now called be Master of such Presbyters, [i. e.] such as had already deserted the former Church Communion] in the Church of God must suffer most lamentable ruine, and desolation. And was not this a case of necessity? Thus Adamus, well seeing the Reformation as much detestable of any relief or countenance from the Greek Church, as from the Roman.

And now, by the two Relations of *Saints*, and *Russi* both Protestants, we may see; how much truth the assertion of Cardinal Perron (in his Reply to King James, Observation 3. c. 22.) hath in it, who there undertakes to make good: That these doctrines, or customs are common to the Western Church with the Oriental, and Meridional (upon which Doctrines, therefore, the Pope's Supremacy may be gathered to have had no influence): Namely; Transubstantiation of bread into the Body of Christ; Adoration of the Eucharist; Oblation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living, and the dead; Prayer to Saints; Veneration of Reliques, and Images: prayer for the dead, Confession Sacramental, and Auricular; Lent; Vows; Celibacy of Religious; Interdiction of Priests to marry after having taken Orders; Seven Sacraments; using, in Divine Service, the original Tongue, not understood by the vulgar: The same doctrine of Free-will, and Justification.

To Perron add Grotius his judgement in the Preface to his *Pol. sum. propae*; where, giving account of the success of his former Studies, he saith: *Si qui secesserant [the reformed] ut factum fuit suerent, affert hanc valde doctrinam Ecclesia ejus, quae cum sede principis cohaerens esse corruptam per multas haereses, & idololatriam. Id mihi causa dedit inquirendi in dogmata ejus Ecclesiae: legendi libros utriusque scriptos: legendi etiam, quae scripta erant de praesenti statu, ac doctrina Ecclesiae ejus quae est in Graecia, & orientis, quae per Asiam & Aegyptum et cohaerent. Inveni in Oriente, eandem esse doctrinam, quae esset in Occidente. Conciliis Universalibus deserta; de Regimine Ecclesiae (antequam cum Papa controversia), [i. e. about his authority] de Sacramentorum perpetuis Rationibus, sententiarum consonantiam.* Therefore the Pope easily indulged the Russian Greek Churches, who are subject to the King of Poland, when they reconciled themselves to the Roman Church, and submitted to his Supremacy, to continue all their former Grecian Rates, and Ceremonies; and the same he permiteth also to the Greek Church in Rome.

This of the modern Greek Church, which now hath two Patri-

§ 83. n. 8.

§ 84. n. 1.

§ 84. n. 2.

Patri-

Patriarch independent of one another, one residing at *Constantinople*, and another at *Jerusalem*, to which latter the *Greeks* in, and about *Palatium* adhere. Now with the *Greek Church* are joined in Religion, and Communion, the *Russian Churches* (excepting those under the King of Poland joined to the *Roman*) the *Labnians* of *Greece*, or *Barbary* and the *Abissinians* of *Egypt* called so by other Sectaries, because they adhere to the Council of *Constantinople*, as the other reported it, to the *Imperial* *Faith*, into whom also I may join the *Armenians*, conforming in their Liturgy and most of the Ceremonies of their Religion to the *Greek Church*, but, in their Communion, now joined to the *Roman*. Of these the *Armenians*, and *Georgians* have two independent Patriarchs of their own, set up without any conciliar authority, the one residing in a Monastery in Mount *Sinai*; the other in a Monastery in Mount *Libanus*. The *Metropolitan* of the *Russians* also hath, of late, cast off his subjection to the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, and stands absolute. Only the *Abissinians* of *Syria* continue their subjection still to the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* translated to *Damascus*, which now ruined.

§. 84. n. 3.

Now inquiry be made after the judgment or practice in the points forementioned of the other Churches, or Sects, in the Eastern parts of the world.

1. Here, 1st. If we should admit some variation or diversity of all these Churches from the rest as to several of these points, yet cannot these, reasonably, be put in the scale to counterbalance the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, shewed already to be united therein. Especially, since these, I mean the remotest Eastern and Southern Churches, and chiefly those comprehended within the Patriarchate of *Alexandria* (with which also the *Ethiopians* or *Abissin* Church hath always run the same course, being a constant adherent to it) were the first part of Christianity, that was ever born with the Bower of *Mahomet* (that great false Prophet, and open enemy of our Lord Christ and his Kingdom) and to the first, wherein the Christian Doctrine and discipline, having not good reason, were opposed, attacked, and corrupted: the most ancient Churches falling under the Mahometan bondage in the fourth Century, before full the abolition of *Roman*, and when the *Syrians*, or *Armenians*, (whom the *Greeks* reckon) were respect for, without the same eye. Against these Churches all the same old and new objections, both, for that several of them have causely departed from the traditions of their former Patriarchs, and have set up new ones in their

their stand. And yet more, for that they had made a sacrifice of their
from the former allowed General Councils; some of them by
maintaining Nestorianism, and others Eutychianism, contrary to
them; and, as the Greek Church had not followed the Council
in the procession of the holy Ghost, so they again from the Greek
in the decisions concerning the unity of the person and plurality of the
nature of our Lord: so to continue in their own opinions.

Of these Christians, then, inhabiting the more Eastern
Countries, *Armenia*, *Mesopotamia*, *Affrica*, *Parthia*, *India*, and
the more Southern, *Egypt*, and *Ethiopia*, (also called *Egypti*
or *Coptis*, these *Abyssinians*); Of these (I say) the *Armenians* have
set up two later Patriarchs of their own, the one for *Armenia* the
greater, the other for the lesser. The *Affricans*, *Parthians*, and *Abs-*
sythians, are ranged also under a new Patriarch, of *Mesal*, or
Babylon; only the *Egyptians*, and *Abyssinians* are subject still to the
Patriarch of *Alexandria*, now removed to *Grand Cairo*, and liv-
ing in a Monastery at some distance from it.

Again, of these
those Christians that are dispersed in *Affrica*, *Perse*, and the more
Eastern parts (except such as are reduced by the *Roman Missions*)
are generally said to profess *Nestorianism*; though this, as *Dr.*
Field observes†, somewhat qualified, they are denying Christ the
son of *Mary* from his first conception to be personally God, (as *Field* of the
Nestorians did) but affirming his human nature so perfect also as *Church*, p.
not to be separated from its personality.

On the other side, 62—*Thomas*
the *Armenian*, and *Jacobites* in *Mesopotamia*, and the *Egyptians* *Jesu de Con-*
(or *Coptites*), and *Ethiopian* (or *Abyssinians*), in *Affrica* are vers. gent.
held guilty of *Eutychianism*, or rather of *Dioscurism*†; (which 17.c.2.
Dioscurus was Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and condemned in the *D. Field* p.
Council of *Chalcedon*); they being said to hold Christ to consist 64, 66—*Tho-*
of two natures indeed, and that they are not one by *communion*, as a *Jesu*
contrary to *Eutyches*; but not to consist in two natures, after the 1.7.c.14.

union of them; but these two natures, then, to become one by coad-
union, according to *Dioscurus*, who held these two natures so unit-
ed, that one personated nature arose out of two not personated,
quoting for it some expressions of *Cyri* his predecessor. If this
were true, that *Dr. Field*, out of *Thomas Jesu*, delivers of these
two Eastern sects, that stand distinct from the Greek Churches,
though they be not perfect *Eutychians*, and *Nestorians* in their opi-
nion, yet such they are, as do still transgress and offend against
the faith and definitions of the third and fourth General Council;
the latter of which the greatest body of them expressly declares in
their *Confession* (see *Dr. Field* c. 1. p. 70, 71.) And, if so, these sects are
standing, that they should be reckoned (as by some Protestants they
are)

† See Eugen.
Liturg. c. 9
Of concern-
ing the Sy-
rian, Arme-
nian, Egre-
tian (or A-
byssine) Li-
turgies. See
Gervinus
his collati-
ons out of
them. Con-
tir. 16 p.
691.

§. 84. n. 5.

and not only a part (which some of their *Western* brethren, or
injustly ignorant, may be naturally, as to making salvation);
but (if the Greek Church be added) the majority of the Christian
Church; nor any reason why her Sacraments should be esteemed de-
fective, without their consecration.

But, notwithstanding these considerations united; yet, as to the nine
forementioned modern controversies of most note, after the most
of these Eastern Churches claim, for as much as may be gathered,
from their publick Liturgies and Offices, which they have either
the same words as of old Greek Church, viz. S. Chrysostom's and
S. Basil's; or very little varying from them; and from the relations
made by Travellers they seem, I say, much what of the same pro-
fession with the Greek Church.

1st. Concerning a *Substantial* Conversion of the Symbols;
or the *essential* presence of our Lord's Body and blood in the Eu-
charist, these all verbin the same expressions in the Consecration
with the Latine, and Greek Churches; from which we may pre-
sume, that they understand them in the same sense; which *sense*
when the Reformers varied from, they did think fit also, in their
new Liturgies, to alter these *expressions*. The same corporal presence
is confirmed; from their offering in the same service this Body
and blood as a *Sacrifice pro vivis, & defunctis* (a part of the *Mass*,
which is also performed in the new Protestant Liturgies); and
from the like reverence performed by them, as by the Greek, and
Latine Church in the handling, and receiving of these stupendous
Sacraments; these Churches, for fear of the least indecencies, either
receiving, after the manner of the Greeks, in a spoon the *Body* of
our Lord intinct in the *Blood*; or else some little portion of the
blood only in a spoon, if they receive the Body and Blood apart;
and some of these Nations, as the *Abyssines*, out of the great reve-
rence to what they have received, are not permitted to spit the same
day that they communicate; and, if such thing happen, it is scraped
off the ground, and disposed of by the Priest; and if a dog should
lick it up, he is presently killed. Lastly, *Brennend* ||, who hath
collected out of several Histories and Relations, in what points
these Eastern Churches are said to differ from the Roman; (for se-
veral Protestants do not so freely give account, wherein they re-
fer with it); yet mentions nothing of their difference in the *con-
secration*, or *transubstantiation*; save only of the *Armenians*, out
of *John Damascene*: But S. Thomas, S. Richardus, *Archiepiscopus*, who
have been already mention'd against their errors; are questioning their
Archiepiscopus; and their *Mass* in this matter, not differing from the rest
(S. Chrysostom's Liturgic. c. 12.) and the former Testaments.

† See Eugen.
Roger Torre
Saints l. 2.
p. 361.
|| Inquiries
c. 15. &c.

cited out of the same. Replies to *Cham* ||, do argue their con-
gruence with the rest in this opinion, and an error in *Guido*. Title
of the original protest.

For the other points following: *Adoration*. Offering the *Eucharist*, as the very Body and Blood of our Lord therein as a *Sacrifice* for the living, and the dead, &c. *Adoration* of the blessed *Virgin*, and the *Saints*. *Praying* for the Dead, as bet-
terable by their intercessions and oblations in their present con-
dition before the day of judgement; these also appear in the same
liturgies; and the second and third necessarily follow from the
first. And see *Thomas* a *Ysa* 1. 7. c. 8. p. 370—383, as to the
practice of the *Abyssine* Churches concerning the *two* last.

† See before

§. 190. n. 2.

§. 24. n. 2.

To proceed to the other four points remaining; *Usser*
Communion in one kind: *A relative veneration* of the *Cross*, and *sa-*
cred Images, or *Pictures*. *Monastick Vows*, and *Celibacy* of the
Clergy, and *Auricular*, or *Sacramental Confession*, and *imposition*
of *penances*.

Concerning the first it is granted: that
a Communion in both kinds is ordinarily used, (though
the *Abyssines* are said sometimes to receive only our Lords Body,
and so do now the *Maronites* †); but, either after the manner of † *Roger* p.
the Greek Church (§. 82. n. 7.) not distinct ||; used in *Egypt* in the 361. 432.
fourth age: and then prohibited there by *Pope Julius* the First †; or, || See *Dr.*
if distinct, a very small quantity of blood, with very great caution, *Field* p. 63.
given in the bottom of a spoon. For the second; the *Cross*, and *Pic-* † *De Consi-*
tures, and a due veneration of them, are used as well in these, as *crat.* 2. 5. 7.
in the Greek, & Roman Church. See for the veneration of *Pictures*
in the *Abyssine* Church (according in most things with the *Egypti-*
ans) *Thom.* a *Ysa* 1. 7. p. 380. And the Priests and Religious are † *Rogers*
said to carry alwayes a *Cross* in their hands †. And for the use of *Terra Sain-*
crossing see the *Liturgies*. *Ep.* 48.

§. 84. n. 2.

For the third; *Monastick Vows*, and *Celibacy* of the *Clergy*.
The first of these cannot be denied to be practised in themall; and
from this therefore the *impossibility* of the second; I mean, of an in-
junction of *Celibacy* to the *Clergy*, is justified, as hath been shewed
before §. 82. n. 7. ; and a necessity of such *Celibacy*, *jure divini*, is
not affirmed by the *Roman* Church. But for the second; The practice
in these Churches is much what the same as in the Greek, viz. that
persons married are freely admitted to be *Presbys*; but none, after
made *Priests*, allowed to marry: which being a yoke, the *law*,
where liberty to take wives before-hand is granted, have a firm
tendency to undergo *despota* in *obsequies*; that many of the *senior* *Cler-*
gy in these other Churches, as well as in the Greek, are *de facto* *Thom.* a *Y-*
married; meanwhile † the *Regulus* that are *Priests* do live alwayes *Thom.* a *Y-*
§. 17. n. 2.

in Calicut, and so do all the Bishops, that are chosen out of Regulars, as they are (so chosen) most frequently in these Churches, as in the Abyssine, and I think in the Greek, they only can be chosen Bishops.

For the fourth, *Abscondit*, or *Sacrament of Confession*, and *penance*, though such confession is few, or none of these Churches (wherein the Church discipline, in such a communion of Mahometanism, and Heathenism, is much decayed) is so strictly observed as in the Roman, or yet as in the Greek Church, either as to their making it so often, as they receive the Communion; or, as to an enumeration of their particular faults, when they make it; yet it seems not to be altogether omitted, or disused, as with Protestants; *Zaga Zaga* an Abyssine Bishop saith † it is used by the Abyssines; and (to give it in *Reverend* words) — That presently upon commission of sin, they use the Confessor; and at every Confession & thought it were every day (receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist again; that — *Mulier: gravidam ante partum semper confessionem, & corpus Domini confessionem accipiunt; ut infans, capiens inde nutrimentum, in eius communicatione sit sanctus* — And — They have great respect (saith the Fr. Recollect) † in all the Sacraments; and as for Confession, they appoint rigorous penances; and those publick for publick offences. And with these Authors may those, quoted by

† *De confessione* *curiali*, L. c. 1. † *Them. a Jesu*, p. 371. † p. 387. † p. 361. † p. 166. † p. 161. † p. 416.

Duillet to say the contrary, well agree: whilst they speak of several parts of a vast Country, or of an usual omission of it by some of these Southern Christians before they receive, (for all receive frequently viz. on all Festivals) † and of a perfunctory performance of it, only in general, by many, when they do it. So *Thom. a Jesu* out of the Bishop of Sicut's Relation † saith of the *Jacbars*, and *Armenians* — *Sacramentum confessionis rarissime* [not, nunquam] *apud nationes illas frequentatur: multique* [not, minus] *communione sine confessione confessionis*. And of the *Septentrionalis* *Americanis* est *confessionis*, *et poenitentia*, *omnis unguis Sacramentum poenitentia recipere* — And † — *Sacramentum Confessionis rarissime, nisi in paucis Ecclesiis Romanis* †. *Confessionis* & *curialis* *Unionis*, *vere non habetur*. Sacramental Confession therefore, in these Churches seems rather a seldom used, and then done not always required, and looks rather like a custom, by the malignity of time, than what is used that never at all known, or used.

And in regard of Confession, perhaps may partly arise from a difference in the way how it is used, for (the only necessary matter of confession) whilst they repeat some part of the general confession (such as — *Confiteor tibi Domine Deus, &c.*) they also repeat some part of the particular confession (such as — *Confiteor tibi Domine Deus, &c.*)

Not, for several reasons, and customs, especially in the

the Abbots, and Clergy of these Eastern, and Southern Churches, they are not observed to be very great: and one of the chiefest causes of their dissent, and contempt of the *Latine Church* (besides the difference, which they have in several other Ceremonies of Religion) to arise from hence, that they see many of them, in such corporal severities, more remiss: See *Agnes, Terra Sancta* l. 2. p. 335. And *Tiboni* in *Yeshu* l. 6. p. 284. *Species anterioris vite, quam edunt Hieronymus, Marcellinus, Archiepiscopus frequenter cernitur Latinarum commendis praeberi occasione, &c.* So the *Abyssine* Religious and Bishops go barefoot, wear hair-cloth; never eat flesh, and in *Lent* (which they begin three days after the Purification, *re Sancte* l. 2. p. 347. and other Fasts eat no Fish, or white meats; make only one meal a day, without any Collation at Supper; drink no wine, though when they happen to be in a Country that affords it; as their own doth not; use disciplines; carry great weights about their bodies. See much what the same abstinences of the Greek Bishops, and Monks; who also keep four Lent, or solemn Fasts in the year, adding to our that of Advent: and other, from the fast of *Martha* to the Assumption of our Lady's mother, from the *Octave* of Whitsuntide to *S. Peter's* day; the same is said of the *Moravian*, the same * or more of the *Armenian* Bishops, and Religious; never eating flesh, nor indulging themselves in their Lent with white meats, or so much as eggs, or any thing boiled. Hence are all these much displeased with the Western liberty of using fish, and wine; and Collations in Lent; and of several Religious Orders eating flesh out of it.

From what hath been said (then) may be discovered the defect of this summary account, which, after a long discourse, Dr. *Field* (in l. 1. c. 10. p. 93.) gives of the Agreement both of the Greek, and other Eastern Churches with the Protestants, in all the principal modern Controversies; where he thus informs his Reader, 1st. (saith he) They all deny, and impugn the supreme universality of *Rome's* jurisdiction, which the Bishop of Rome pretendeth. [Of this see below, l. 3. c. 16.] 2nd. the Greeks allowing, though not so much as the Pope claimeth, yet more than I think any Protestants will consent to. 3rd. (saith he) They think him just in his power over all other Bishops. 4th. They deny, that he hath any power to dissolve the Principalities and Kingdoms of the world, as *deposed Kings*. [So concerning both these do Roman Catholics hold.] 5th. They will not be so high in their sense of infallibility, as that it is infallible in its own nature; but so the *major*, and *majoris* part of it.

And the Roman Catholic Doctrine is;

That

That in many things we offend all: that, though some may be, yet most of the good works of the regenerate are not, free from mixture of venial sin, or some imperfection; that none certain, (except by extraordinary Divine Revelation), of his justification (or, as the Protestants had rather call it, Sanctification); and for this the Cardinal's *Tuissimum est*, &c. is very famous: But do no Protestants presume further?]

9ly. They admit not the merit of congruence, condignity, nor works of supererogation. And 10ly. They teach not the doctrine of satisfaction, as the Romanists do.

[The Doctrine of the Roman Church (rightly understood), concerning these points is neither contradicted by the Eastern Churches, nor by some sober Protestants; but indeed much misrelated by Dr. Field l. 3. p. 58.]

7ly. They believe not Purgatory, neither pray to deliver men out of temporal punishments [I suppose he means, or sufferings] after this life. [It is true, they believe no Purgatory-fire; but, that they hold some temporal sufferings, from which they are freeable by prayer made for them, See before §. 82. n. 6. and Sir Edw. Sand's testimony §. 83. n. 2. And enough confessed in this matter even by Dr. Field l. 3. p. 59. ¶ I rightly understand him.]

8ly. They reject the doctrine of the Romanists touching indulgences, and pardons. [The same is returned to this, as to the fifth and sixth.]

9ly. They believe not, that there are seven Sacraments: [This is questioned on'y for Confirmation, and Extreme Unction; and see these maintained by Jeronim the Patriarch, and many other Authors, as to the Greek Church*. In other Eastern Churches Chrism, or holy Oyl is so used, at least for Baptism, as it is in the Greek Church; and in some Churches also to sick, or dying persons.]

10ly. They have many Ceremonies in Baptism, which the Roman Church useth, in sprinkling, &c. [Nor doth the Roman Church hold it necessary, that they should use the same.]

11ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

12ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

13ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

14ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

15ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

16ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

17ly. They have no private Masses. [It is accidental in the Roman Church, that any Masses are private; i. e. that the Priest communicates alone; and happens only, because others are not prepared to receive with the Priest, not because they are prohibited; and if any faulty herein, it is the people, or other Clergy, that attend the Mass without communicating, not the Priest in offering the daily Christian Sacrifice, and himself at least participating thereof; the Greeks never communicating alone celebrate seldom, viz. only on Festivals; on those dayes only one of them, all the rest attending him: and this, in the same Church, but once, so that their more compleatness in one thing is accompanied with some deficiency in another. Lastly, the Church of Rome wisheth, that so

* Resp. 1. §. 7.
See Goars
Eucholog.
concerning
Confirmation
on p. 366.
--- Concern-
ing Extrem
Unction,
their Offici-
um Sancti
Olai, p. 408.
432.
[From a 70-
su. p. 361,
398, & 387

Masses at all were private (i. e. where the Priest officiating finds no fellow Communicants) but is loth to purchase this at such a loss, as some others do; viz. the omissions of her frequent, and dayly, or also hourly, intercessions with God for all necessities, by this most acceptable sacrifice offered to him by the fervent devotion of so many of her Priests.

12ly. *They minister the Communion in both kinds to all Communicants.* [Of this see what is said before § 82. n. 7. The Church of Rome holds it not necessary but only lawful, and expedient (as the times are) to do otherwise; and also indulgeth receiving in both kinds to several of her Communion.]

13. *They believe not Transubstantiation, nor the new real sacrificing of Christ.* [In the Eucharist is affirmed by the Roman Church only a Sacrifice commemorative of that of the Cross; and this effective only in the virtue and merit of that. Of the Eastern Church's Tenent concerning Christ's corporal presence in the Eucharist, and consequently of their use of this Sacrifice agreeing with the Roman Church, and contrary to the Reformed, See before § 82. n. 2. and n. 4.]

14ly. *They have the Divine Service in the vulgar tongue.* [Some Eastern Churches have so, the most have not. The Divine Service is celebrated in the corrupt Chaldee, or Syriack, amongst the *Maronites, Cophites, Nestorians, Assyrians or Jacobites, Indians*; and in the Greek, among the *Melchites, and Georgians*, the vulgar to all these being *Arabick*, or to some, more Eafterly, the *Persian* tongue; and in the ancient and pure Greek still, among the *Grecians*, (as it is in the Latine among the *Latines*), where those, who speak the vulgar Greek do understand little of it. (See *Brerewood's Enquiries* p. 9. 12. 61. 192. 196.) Only, in the East, the *Armenians*; in the North, the *Moscovites* and some other *Slavonians*; in the South, the *Abyssines*, people most ignorant of the learned languages, have it in their vulgar; and, in this, have only what the Church of Rome maintaineth lawful, and easily indulgeth to several Nations of its Communion, as it did long ago to the *Slavonians*, by Pope John 8. and now of late to the *Chinenses* by Pope Paul 5. at the request of the *Jesuites*.]

15ly. *Their Priests are married; and though they permit them not to marry a second wife without special dispensation, yet if any do, they do not void nor dissolve the marriage.* [To this see what is said before § 82. n. 7. with them men married may receive Orders, after Orders received none may marry.] 16ly. *They make an image of God.* [Nor any among the *Latines*, with the same intention, as other images; viz. thereby to resemble the figure, or nature of God; such an *De Imag. image verum Idolum constituit* (saith *Bellarmine*) ||. Only this l. 2. c. 8.

is by many held lawful, to paint an holy History in a Table, and that to represent to some mens eyes, what hath been seen by other men's; as the sitting of the Ancient of days in *Daniel* c. 7. or the descent of the Holy Ghost in *Mat.* c. 3. That is, not to shew what these persons are, but how they have appeared, where there is no danger of mistake by it what they are; as also incorporeal *Angels* are innocently represented winged boyes J. 17ly. They have no *Muddy images*, but pictures only. ¶ But they give the same relative veneration to sacred pictures (which Protestants omit to mention) as the *Latines* to their images; though some *Latines* also do forebear the use of embossed images. 18ly. They think, that, properly, God only is to be invoked; and howsoever they have a kind of invocation of *Saints*; yet they think that God only heareth them, and not the *Saints*. ¶ God only is properly invoked, as the only fountain, and donor of all we petition for, say also *Roman Catholicks*; and the *Saints* only are sued to, as *Comprecators*; that what follows, is misrelated, see before §. 82. n. 3. This is opposed to *Dr. Fields* account, how rightly, is left to your judgment. Meanwhileras in these points *Dr. Field* hath noted the Eastern and Western Churches to differ; so we may conclude; that, in those other points of modern controverſie that are omitted by him; (as *Freewill*, *Justification* not by faith alone; *adoration of the Eucharist*; and *offering* *in vivo*, & *defunctis*; *Monastick life*, and *unms*; *Sacramental Confession*, and penances; their publick *Service*, and the *Ceremonies attending it*;) they do agree; or, that this Doctor was somewhat overseen in his choice.

§. 85. n. 2.

To this *consent* of the modern *Greek Church* with the *Roman*, in many of the modern Controversies much urged, especially from *Zachary Patriarch of Constantinople* his censure, by *Roman Catholicks* to prove the Protestant a departure, not from the *Roman* only, but the whole modern *Catholic Church*, you may see, if you please, what answers have been returned by several other late Protestant Writers; by Arch. Bp. *Levett* 2. n. 4. by Bp. *Brank* Reply to *Chetwode* c. 13. 34. by *Dr. Gunning* in a conference with some of the *Roman* party called *Schism* unmarked p. 605. by *Dr. Stillingfleet* *Rational Doctrines* part 2. c. 8. p. 500. &c. And by the *Wimberg Divines* against *Sacerdotes* in the preface before their Acts with the same Patriarch.

To give you some account of them; and here to begin with these last, who first began in Their *Tulius Divines* in their Reply to *Sacerdotes*, which they produced writings wherein the *Roman* doctrine is set forth with *blasphemous Communion* in both kinds;

a.

b.

n.

s.

Church of Rome; (c) *hence* they are from the belief of Purgatory in the Roman sense. *That* the Patriarch doth also profess his *consent* with Protestants; (d) *that* the Sacrament was to be received in both kinds; (e) *that* the use of Adultery was not absolutely to be forbidden the Clergy. And (f) *that* he opposed also invocation of Saints in such a sense, as that they bear us. Thus he; and some of these are mentioned also in the forecited conference with Dr. Gunning.

§. 85. n. 4.

To a.

To what he saith, first to (a) I answer; that, as Protestants urge this present illiterate, and desolate condition of the Eastern Churches, when their opinions or practice make against them; so it is meet they should remember it, when, in their appealing to a General Council, they seem to set so high a value on the judgment and sentence of these remote Churches therein; resting no way satisfied with that of the West.

Next; I say, whatever corrupt practices have prevailed of late times in the East, yet that as for those, wherein both East; and West (that is, the whole Catholick visible Church) at Luther's coming agreed in (especially, when at such amity between themselves), these Churches, in both of them having the like customs, do bear mutual witness to one another, that they could be no innovators in either of them.

§. 85. n. 5.

To b.

To (a) *viz.* the Greek Churches their agreeing in some things with Protestants against the Church of Rome, as in others with the Roman Church against Protestants; from which it seems to follow, that the Church of Rome, must as well be culpable of Schism, or any other crime, in what the Greeks and Protestants differ from it; as the Protestants, in what the Greeks, and the Roman accord in, against it; I answer, that any Churches co-ordinate may, without Schism or fault, differ from one another, or one of them from all the rest, in several doctrines and opinions, if such opinions or doctrines, be not defined, or the practice of them not required by any their Superiors; but any Church differing from the rest in any doctrine formerly defined, or to which conformity is required by their Superiors, or by the Bible; I mean either by a General, or any other Superior Council, where with also the belief, or practice of the same is constant; such Church cannot be freed from Schism. Now that several of those points, wherein the Protestants have left the Greeks and Rome, when agreeing in them, are such; See Disc. 1. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. But not such those, wherein the Roman, and Western Churches differing from it, do differ from the East and Protestants. (b) *viz.* the Church of Rome; I answer, that the Church of Rome, when agreeing in them, are such; See Disc. 1. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. But not such those, wherein the Roman, and Western Churches differing from it, do differ from the East and Protestants.

§. 85. n. 6.

To c.

To (a) *viz.* the East of the Eastern Churches with Protestants, viz. their opposing

posing the Pope's Supremacy; I answer, that, though there are several branches of the Pope's Supremacy, which the modern Greeks allow not, (but, so, there are also some, that the French Church doth not admit) yet it is well known, that thus much the Representatives of the Greek Church in the Council of *Albanus* subscribed; That the Bishop of Rome was Successor *Petræ Principis Apostolorum, Petrusque Ecclesiæ Caput; &c.* in *Beato Petro, gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam plena potestate tradita est*; and the Greek Church never denied his Primacy, and Presidency in General Councils; as appears; * by the fifth Canon of the second General Council at *Constantinople* confining only of Eastern Bishops. — *Constantinopolitana Civitatis Episcopum habere oportet Primatus honorem post Episcopum Romanum* * By the Eastern Bishops in the fourth General Council (the most numerous of any that hath been) allowing the Presidency to the Roman Bishops Legates; (witness Arch-Bp. *Laud* &c.) * By *Cyriacus* Eastern Bishop presiding in the third General Council; *De Cælestini, Episcopatum antiquæ Romæ gerentis, locum obtinens*; (witness *Evagrius*) || *Evagrius* whose Deputy, or Legate also he was made for the Excommunication of *Nestorius* by the authority of the Apostolick See; witness, the Pope's Letter to *Cyrius* &c. [witness *Evagrius* &c. loco citato] *Act. Conc. potestatem usque iusmodi sententiarum exequenda* &c. &c. and Dr. *Stillingfleet* *Ephef. tom. 2. l. 1. c. 1.* * by the Roman Legates also subscribing the first General Council of *Nice* before all the Patriarchs; and I know not why it is, that Protestants, granting this Bishop the Primacy among the Patriarchs; (and, why should he, being the Bishop of the chief See, saith Dr. *Stillingfleet* ||, in case of general concernment of the Church, as was of *Chalcedon* [I add, and of other General Councils] not be allowed by his Legates to be the prime place? yet should take so much pains to show do so, than in some Councils, He, or his Legats, had it not, or did not preside therein. To the second; (2.) I answer, had Dr. *Stillingfleet* not thrust in the term *Roman* the infallibility of which, taken singly, is an Article of Faith in the *Western Church* || by which infallibility of the Church Catholic, or of her lawful General Councils in their definitions concerning matters of Faith; *Marcellus* knew the Greek Church to use the therein no less to it, or them than the Romans doth. Of which thus saith the *Constantinopolitan* Patriarch in his first answer to the *Lutheran* Disputation || *Quæ enim Synodice (legitima Conciliorum ratione) mandata sunt, ea ab omnibus fidelibus recipiuntur, eamque scripturam divinitus inspiratam consonantia.* To which Synodical decrees therefore this

p. 214.

1. 1. c. 4.

Act. Conc.

Ephef. tom. 2.

p. 487.

p. 488.

See Stillm.

from p. 482.

p. 489.

p. 489.

To.

See Bellm.

de Concil.

1. 2. c. 6.

p. 139.

Cap. de A.

p. 139.

p. 28.

sanctum of life, is warranted by any authority of the Greek Church. To subscribe it is, for their modern Liturgies, and Rituals, and the other authorities, not to be quoted before for several points (S. 82. n. 2. Sec.) concurring with what *Jeremias* hath delivered.

Bishop *Bramhall* opposeth to this testimony of *Jeremias*, the contrary testimony of *Cyris* late Patriarch there in the Confession of his Faith, which had not the new set-up Press at Constantinople been disturbed, he intended to have printed there, and to have dedicated to the King of England. (See *Knowles True Hist. A. D. 1628. &c.*) Having installed some, who had relation to him, to be educated in his University of Paris.

To which I answer, 1st. That, to shew, that the Protestant Reformation was not made from the whole Church Catholick, but only the Roman, we are to prove, not what the Grecian opinions are since, but what they were, when first the Reformation was made. Now *Jeremias* his declaration was not long after the beginning of the Reformation, and *Cyris* above 50. years after his.

Concerning the newness of *Cyris*'s opinions, the words of *Knowles* (*ibid.*) are considerable, who there saith, — That he was a reverend and learned man, and that he desired to reform many errors, and to enlighten much of the blindness of his Church. So that it seems he was a Reformer in the Greek Church, as those others were in the Western; which also appears from the complaints and persecution against him, more than against his Predecessors, by the Agents of the Roman Church, upon this pretence (*Knowles. ibid.*). And he is said, at last, for certain crimes objected to him, and among

others charged with innovations in Religion by the Greeks, to have been imprisoned, and shortly after executed, and another *Cyris* ab *Iberia*, formerly rejected, to have been repossessed of his Chair. But 3^{dy}. How contrary soever *Cyris*'s opinions are to those of *Jeremias*; yet the same testimonies above-named, that shew *Jeremias*'s to be the doctrines of the Greek Church shew *Cyris*'s (who ever had new reformed him) not to be so.

Indeed his Declaration, though it seems purposely moulded according to the Calvinistic expressions, is very short, and sparing; general, and unclear; extending to few points, and waving the rest, and forbearing there to mention any one point (save that of the procession of the holy Ghost) wherein the Greeks differ from the reformed (as surely in some they do) ; and again, those points therein, in which *Cyris* seems more clearly to contradict both *Jeremias*'s, and the Roman tenents, namely the denying of Purgatory, and of Transubstantiation, (if therein he intend to deny all sorts of Purgatory, though not by fire ; and all transmutation of the Elements

§. 85. n. 9.

|| Spondan.

A. D. 1638.

Exerc. a S.

Clara Sy-

stem fidei.

p. 528.

|| §. 82. n. 2.

6. 7.

ments in the Eucharist), are unquestionably singular, & not owned by the Greeks, as it is shewed before, & as is witnessed also by some Reformed || §. 83. n. 2. 4, out of the common relations of the Grecian opinions, & practices. If Cyril, or any other Patriarch of Constantinople should entertain any reformed and new opinions diverse from his predecessors, whilst such a one is not followed in them by the rest of the Church, These are to be stiled, not its doctrines, but his own; and it is not denied that Patriarchs as well as others may be heretical, for in several Ages some have been so. But say, If the rest of the Greek Church should also have concurred with Cyril in such innovation, then will this only follow, that it is true of the Greek Church, as of the Protestants, that they also have reformed from the whole Catholick Church, (i.e.) from the former, as well Greek Church, as Latin; and so, this fact of theirs will prove no just plea for the Protestants practice, (if a departure from the Church Catholick be *Schism*), but only the enlargement of the same guilt to another Church.

Having thus, in these two last Chapters, somewhat more copiously insisted upon those two Considerations, which seem so much to aggravate the Protestants separation, and defection, from the Roman Church, now I shall proceed to give you that satisfaction, you may have long expected from me, touching the thing proposed before. §. 86. and as I conceive fitly reserved for the Conclusion of this Work, viz: The solution of those many Questions, and Objections, here summ'd all together, which are made by Protestants against that Supreme, Ecclesiastica, Infallible Judge, that is maintained in these Discourses.

CHAP. IX.

Solutions of several Protestants Questions concerning the Supreme Ecclesiastical Infallible Judge, maintained in these Discourses.

1. *Q. From what we can be assured, that Councils are infallible, since neither the Texts of Scripture, the sense whereof is disputed; nor the Decree of any Council, whose erring is the thing questioned, can give such assurance? §. 86.*
2. *Q. From whence General Councils receive their Infalibility: Such promise, if made at all, being made only to the Church dissuave, and*

- and not delegable, by this Church, in which : Q. 1. If so, in such Delegation from the Universal Church appearing as above said, beforehand, made to let us say : General Councils &c. §. 85.
3. Q. How the infallibility of General Councils is necessary or serviceable to the Church ; without which Councils the Church subsisted, for several ages, in the Apostles ? §. 86.
 4. Q. How Lawfull General Councils, which experience hath shewed, to have contrary and contrary members, can be infallible ? §. 87.
 5. Q. Lawfull General Councils being supposed to be liable to error in some things ; how Christians can be assured, concerning any particular point, that in such Councils do not erre ? §. 88.
 6. Q. Whist such Councils are supposed infallible ; How, if they should not be so, can any error of theirs be rectified ? §. 89.
 7. Q. Whether such Councils, only when confirmed by the Pope, or also when yet unconfirmed by Him, are infallible ? §. 90.
 8. Q. How the Pope's Confirmation can any way concur to such Councils non-erring ; since, if it erre before, it doth so still, though he approve it : but, if orthodox before, it is so still, he not approving it ? §. 91.
 9. Q. In which, (the Pope, or the Council,) does Infalibility lie ? For, if in one of them, the other is needless : if in Both, then either of them sufficient : such qualities being indivisible, and without integral Parts ? §. 106.

Against, then, a living infallible Ecclesiastical Judge of Controversies in necessary matters of Religion, which hath been asserted in these discourses ; & the Church Governours, in a Lawful General Council, affirmed to be so, many difficulties are urged ; Questions. and some, with much subtilty ; which, it seems to me, may be, with as much plainness, satisfactorily removed.

1st. Then, it is asked, whence can arise a sufficient certainty to Christians, that lawfull General Councils are infallible ? Q. 1.
 Since it cannot arise, * from the Decree of any Council ; because ¶ See Dr. Stillingfl. p. 509, 539;
 we know not, whether Councils err in such a Decree, till this thing first be stated to us, that they are infallible. Nor, 558.
 2ly. * From the Scripture : Because this were to make the Scripture the sole Judge of this great Controversie, which Catholicks deny to be sole Judge of any : and, if Scripture may decide this Controversie, it may as well all others : for that it is evident, that there are no places of Scripture, whose sense is more controverted, than the sense of those which are urged concerning the Church's infallibility : if therefore these may be understood, without a li-

ving, and infallible Judge, so, as that we may be certain of their true sense, then why not all others which concern the rule of Faith, and manners, whose sense is far less disputed, than, of these?

§. 87.

To which I answer, that as touching Scripture, That *Scripture*, though it cannot properly be a Judge to decide any dispute about its sense; yet may be a rule, plain, and free enough from obscurity, in its sense, even there, where some corrupt and interested judgements may question it; nor is it to be thought really ambiguous, wherever disputed or controverted; and that, though the *claims* of this *Rule* can never be pretended, or such argument, in reason, made use of on that side, where a few do oppose either the common *traditional* sense of former ages, or of the *much major* part of the present age; yet on the other side, the sense thereof, that is given by the *common judgment*, either of former, or present, times, may be reasonably urged against these few; and, especially where a superior Authority requires their conformity, to such a sense, they ought to yield unto it. And here see at your leisure what he saith || (who urgeth this), both concerning Scripture wrested by some in its sense, even in those places of it, where it is a *Rule of necessary faith and manners*; and concerning the Christian's duty herein, to follow the common sense, and consent of the Church. Now, that these Scriptures here spoken of (however by some of late controverted) have been alwayes understood, in the common sense of the Church, to declare a promise of *infallibility* in its Governours, for *necessaries*, appears sufficiently by the proceedings of her Councils ancient and modern; requiring, upon *Anathemas*, assent to their decrees, and inserting some of them in the Creeds. Of which more by and by || Here then

|| Stillings.
Rat. Accou.
p. 58, 59.

|| §. 90.

it is denied; that Scripture, whenever controverted by a few in some age against the traditional and common sense of the Church, both in the former and present age (as the Texts concerning the Trinity were now of late by the *Socinians*) is no Rule plain, or free, enough from obscurity in the traditional sense thereof, to decide such controversies.

|| §. 88.

My answer (for so much as is affirmed of Generall Councils; namely, their infallibility in all their definitions, made in necessary matters of faith;) That Protestants themselves grant a sufficient certainty both from *Scripture*, and from *Universal Tradition*; that the Church Catholick of all ages is unerring in necessities; and that this Church Catholick alwayes doth, and shall consist as well of a guiding and ruling Clergy, as a guided, and subject Laity. And that thus far there is no controversy, concerning evidence of Scripture, or Tradition in this matter. And next, from

hence

Hence it certainly follows, that there shall be no certain Body of Clergy in some place or other for or against any in necessaries. And again, from this; that this Clergy, which is to be in a general assembly, or Council, and unanimously consenting, shall never err in necessities. And then in the last place, if perhaps some smaller number of them do dissent from the rest, since the Catholic Church is always but one, and hath a Government at peace within it self; and considered like one fabric and union of its members in respect of one another, and in respect of the whole; here also it certainly follows, (though the self-protestants will not nor cannot safely for their cause accompany us this far) that the great, *the* and *the* *disputed* body of this Clergy, in any *discussion* of some members from it must be, of these two parts dissenting; that Guide whom Christians are obliged to follow, and the fallen and inferior part obliged to conform to; and therefore this, of the two, the Guide shewing, as hath been shewn already, Dile 2. §. 23. &c. Dile. 17. 28. &c. Here they wish a sufficient certainty, in reason, from the principles conceded by Protestants, of the unerring of a lawfully General Council in necessities; without shewing the Decree of any Council for or against any in necessities.

3ly. Setting aside any declaration of Scripture, in this matter of infallibility; and supposing, the Gospel had not been writ; yet both the Teachers of the Gospel for ever (in their general Council at least) must, in such case, have been *infallible* in necessities; *else*, from whence, or by what other means, no Scriptures being extant, could people have certainly learnt the way to salvation? since all Points necessary to be believed are not so cleared to all persons by a self-evident Tradition as some care. And also, this their *infallible* guidance must have been made sufficiently *credible* to the world by the tradition constantly descending from the testimony of our Lord; and his Apostles; who confirmed his first testimony by Miracles: else, the Christian, would have been a rational, Religion. By which testimony also it was, that those first Teachers, substituted by the Apostles, had full credit with and did beget *infallible*, and saving faith in their Gentile Auditors, before that the Holy Scriptures were delivered unto the Gentiles; and therefore it appears, that these Teachers and their successors might have been able to this day, with sufficient certainty, relied on in their propagating; and preserving the Christian faith among their Converts, had there been no Scriptures at all, to have taught the same things with them; and to have been witnesses to their Doctrine. Neither may it reasonably be said, that the Church's possession of these Scriptures hath a slighting of her Governors of any

† See Scilicet
ing. p. 559.

8.
5.00.

part of that authority, and belief, which is agreed, that they might have challenged, had there been no Scripture, but the present Church charged full on the Spirit, to be believed by her child, even to be infallible in all necessary truth, as the Apostles were believed to be so by those, who heard them, & only, from sufficiently credible witnesses, had heard of, but did not see any of, their Miracles. And then; supposing first this their infallibility in necessary truth, that made credible to many sufficient evidence in point of reason, to mark to believe them also, when in their Councils, they tell us also they are infallible in all necessary (if this be a truth necessary to be known) upon this very account, because they tell us so: As he, that once believes, that whatever is said in Gods Word is true, is to believe also, *that Gods Word is true*, because this Word tells so. Here then you see, that there would have been a sufficient certainty of assurance to Christians, depending by Tradition, of their being truly and infallibly guided by the Substitutes of our Lord to the end of the world, without the decree of any Council presupposed; and without any Scriptures extant. The same infallible guidance therefore is now had and known sufficiently from them, though we put all the Scriptures.

And again, By primitive Tradition, the *Catholic Church* in her *General Councils* hath always thought her self authorized to define matters of faith upon *Apocryphal* dissenters; and to put those definitions (as thought fit) in the Church's *Credo* with an obligation laid on all, to believe them. And the Church generally hath also clearly showed such their practice, in yielding a constant obedience and submission of judgment to their decrees. Now either this will imply the infallibility of these Councils (as both they and their Subjects have understood it,) in such points; or, if this be thought as but something less, let but the same privilege still be continued to the present Church Catholic in her Councils, and the same obedience yielded by her subjects to her present definitions; and a sufficient certainty hereof granted, viz. that such authority she hath, and such duty they owe: and any further extent of infallibility I suppose will not be claimed.

Here again we see, that Tradition is the practice of Councils; and of the whole Church, without any their express Decree to this purpose, shews a sufficient certainty of such an infallibility or authority of Councils, as is challenged.

Thus much in answer to this last Query. Where, the asking the same Principle of Catholics; that none can have a sufficient certainty of any thing (either from Scripture, or Church

Tradition,

Tradition grounded at first on *Ministry* antecedent to the Church's authority, defining it in a general Council, causeth in some Protestants much enlarging; in this, and several other points. But now, if we return a like Query upon themselves, who profess also a *suppleness* to *conscience*, in their faith, even of those points, that are in controversy (or it furtherth, if they profess so much concerning any one such point); and ask, whence they have such certainty; I see not what rationally they can reply or suggest for their Ground.

For 1st. They cannot build such a certainty, as to all points necessary to be believed on a self-evident Tradition, abstracting from Church or Scripture Authority, because, though some may be, yet all such points are not delivered by an express and convincing Tradition, as to all persons concerned in the belief of them: and in such Tradition, if repaired to, a much major part of the Christian world opposeth them. Nor yet 2^{ly}, on any Church-authority, since they deny any infallibility, or sufficient certainty as to such points in the Declarations or Doctrines of this Authority, even in the supremest Collection thereof, the Councils General, present, or past. Nor 3^{ly}, on the *Scriptures*, because the true sense of them, in these points, is not only disputed (which is here urged by them as sufficient to null a certainty); but, by the much major part of Christendom. (and this, after the Protestants manifesting to the world all the grounds of their persuasion.) said to be clear against their new pretensions. But 4^{ly}. Since the Gospel was dispersed and sown in the world by Christ's Substitutes, and Ministers, and a multitude of souls saved thereby, before the penning, or publishing of the *New Testament* or *Gospel-Scriptures*; and therefore possibly the same Gospel might, in the same manner, have continued to have been dispersed to the end of the world; or for a much longer time, than it was so: this Query will still foret press them; if it be demanded, what certainty, in such a case, they (I mean, either Protestants, or the rest of the Christian world learning their faith from *Teachers*, without *Scripture*) could have had of their faith? Or whence? Or whether no certainty, in such case, to be had?

2^{ly}. Again it is asked, || from whence *General Councils* should derive this their *infallibility*, or upon what commission they pretend it? Because 1st. The divine promises of infallibility (if made to any) are made only to the *diffusive Body* of the Catholic Church. Neither can she bequeath or delegate this infallibility to her assigns in a General Council, if no such power of devolution be contained in the original Grant; nor it can be shewed, that

§. 91.

Q. 2.

|| See Archb.

Law p. 228.

239. --- Stil-

ling p. 515.

the 516. §. 3.

the maker of the promises did either appoint a General Council to represent the Church; or, in such representation, to be infallible.

But 2ly. Neither can it be made evident, that the universal Church hath *de facto* either by a formal act, or by a tacit consent, devolved, either its infallibility, or its whole power, and authority on, or given any commission to, any General Council to appear in behalf of the universal Church; which Commission were there any such, must precede the being of such a Council; and also is necessary, not only to the first, but *ratæ, quæritæ*, to every General Council: but, that the universal Church did ever agree in any such act, is utterly impossible to be demonstrated, either that it was, or could be.

3ly. Neither, suppose it had such a delegation, yet can this representative, upon this, lay title to our *Lords*, or to any *divine*, institution (of which there cannot be produced one title from Scripture, either of Christs conveying over the Church's power to it, or of any particular order from the Apostles, concerning it) but only must owe it wholly to the Church's, i. e. humane, institution. And, if we enquire, when thus instituted, what authority such Council hath, *The utmost* (saith Dr. Stillingfleet p. 16.) *that can be supposed is this*, That the parts of the Church [*i. e.* such parts, whom, by their delegation, and chusing of them, the persons in the Council represent.] may voluntarily consent to accept of the decrees of such a Council; and by that voluntary act, or by the supreme [*civil*] authority enjoying it, such decrees may become obligatory. Thus he. And thus I think the authority of General Councils is sufficiently pared. Their authority only *derivative* from that Body which yet they pretend to bind by their acts; None of them a representative of the whole; which whole neither hath, nor can, make any such representative; Commissioned by some parts of the Church only; The promises of divine assistance, as to infallibility, not made to them (if any made), but only to the whole *diffusive* Body of the Church Catholic (from whose laws, let us but once take away Councils, Protestants are secure enough); Nor such promises possible by the Church diffusive to be made over, or assigned to them; These Councils, not of Christ's, nor *Apostolical*, but only *humane*, institution; And lastly, which can oblige only those parts of the Church, which do voluntarily consent to accept of their Decrees. One would suspect, that General Councils have been no great friends to Protestantism, when they put in so many bars to keep out their Decrees from annoying the Reformation. Men seldom vilify an Authority, that favours them.

To all this I answer as distinctly as I can. That the

the Church-Governours, whenever assembled in Council, do act by the self-same authority (received from our Lord, and by their Divine Institution) by which they act singly in their several charges; and that all the rest of the Church Catholick are their subjects, obliged in all duty to them, as much (is not more) when con-as dis-joyned. For, as Dr. Hammond answers the Catholick Gentleman (in clearing of himself, that his mentioning of Schism against Bishops, Metropolitans, and Primats, involved also Schism against the Councils compounded of all these) — It is evident, that this Power, which severally belongs to these Bishops, is united in that of the Council compounded of them; and so, the despising of that, [the power of such Councils] is an offence under the first sort of Schism; and a breach of the subordination to all the ranks of our Ecclesiastical Superiours. What authority, then, and whence they had it singly, they have, united. Neither is this their authority either in their several Provinces, or in their Synods, delegative, save from Christ, and his Apostles.

2. Next: That they are not pretended to have their infallibility in necessities, by any assignment from the Church diffusive, but, that they have it immediately from the divine promises, made principally, and primarily to them, to whom is committed the feeding of our Lords sheep for ever, and the guiding them in the right way, of which see Disc. 1. §. 7. 14. and that the Church diffusive is, therefore, unerring for ever in necessities, because these Guides are so; and the reason, why the gates of Hell cannot prevail against the Church, the building, is, because, in the chief place, they shall not prevail against these Pastors, Teachers, the Rocks, and Foundations, whereon it is built. And, if such promise be made primarily to them; then surely, made to them in this their most comprehensive capacity, when all joyned together, and each one's Talents are employed for the benefit Universall of the whole flock. If, at any time, the Church, in the Acts, might use the title [*Videtur est Spiritus Sanctus & nobis cap. 15. 28.*] then in their general assembly; and when they were collected in num ver. 25. every smaller meeting of them, or also every single person, seeming much less capable thereof; and if this inerrability necessary to them in any manner at all, most necessary it will be in these highest Courts, to which ultimately all others do appeal, and whose Laws all are bound to obey. See before §. 8.

34. As to the convening and composition of this conjunct Judicatory of the Clergy, I answer, 1st. That these Church-Governours are, by our Lords and Apostolical constitution, placed in a due subordination one to another, described, Disc. 2. §. 23, 24. and several Superiours endowed with power to assemble

§. 93.

§. 94.

semble them, in greater, or lesser Bodies, as the business requires, & times permit: those Superiors being sometimes assisted herein by the Secular powers, as in the times after Constantine; yet sometimes also doing it without them, as in the ages preceding Constantine; the Diocesan Synod being convened by the Bishop; the Provincial, or National, by the Metropolitane, or Primate; and General, by the Prime Patriarch, and Bishop of the chief Apostolick See.

† p. 668. &
p. 511.

[For why not an Ecclesiastical person have the right of calling a General Council; as well as the Metropolitane, of a Provincial Synod; the Primate, of a National; and (as Dr. Field ascends higher (the Patriarch, of a Patriarchal?—For it is evident (saith he †) that there is a power in Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs, to call Episcopal, Provincial, National, and Patriarchal Synods; yet the last of which consisteth of the Bishops living under the temporal Government of several Princes]: and that neither so depending of, and subject to, the power of Princes, but that, when they are enemies to the faith [I add by the same reason, or enemies to the Orthodox faith] they may exercise the same without their consent or privacy; and may subject them, that refuse to obey their summons, to such punishments, as the Canons of the Church do prescribe in cases of such contempts, or wilful negligence, Thus he.]

2. Next. That these conjunct Proceedings, and Judicature, of the Church-Guides in greater causes, do appear also to be sufficiently allowed, and authorized by our Lord, and his Apostles, both * from those Texts which mention, and refer to a conjunct authority; [as, from *Mat. 18. 17. Tell the Church*—which signifies a presence, of more than one of those, who were to judge—and from verse 20. *When two or three are gathered together in my name. [i. e. by my authority for Judicature, as appears by the context, vers. 18. their binding, and loosing (from which the Council of Chalcedon † gathers, a simile to Leo, vi and maps, the authority of more general assemblies)]—and, from *2 Cor. 13. 4, 5. When ye are gathered together put away from among you, &c.* [Yet is the Clergy chiefly, Excommunication being an Act only of the Clergy of Corinth]. And also* from the Example in the Acts, where, upon the first great controversy, a Council was called to consider it; in which, though there was much disputing † (as useth to be in other Councils) yet the Conclusion made therein, was enjoyed to the whole Church not only by, or in, the name of the Apostles, but of the whole Council; and was enjoyed by these, as attested by that infallible Holy Ghost (*vers. 28.*) by which holy Ghost also they are said to be constituted Governors of the Church, *Acts. 20. 28. The Decrees of which Council S. Paul* afterward, every where, in his perambulations, delivered to be observed, *Acts. 16. 4.* And lastly, * from the*

† *Acts. 15.*
6, 7.

the *pattern* (established by God, *Deut. 17.*) of the former Church under the Old Testament (which pattern that of the Gospel generally followeth): whose chiefe? Court for deciding Controversies was a *Consistory*, or *Council*; which also we find, in the four Gospels, and in the *Acts*, to be called, upon all greater occasions.

4ly. That, in this meeting, though all these Governors (I mean the Bishops) who succeeded the Apostles in the chief ruling of the Church, have right, and also are obliged in duty to their Superiors when summoning them (greater inconveniencies not hindering), to be present: yet because the Churches of God, have perpetual need of the residency of several of them, Hence it is, that, as some of these successors of the Apostles personally sit in the Council, and act there upon no other delegated authority save their own, held from Christ; so others are only there *represented* by their fellows, who are many times deputed also by them in their necessary absence to declare their sentiments, and vote, in matters of present debate, in their stead: In respect of these absent Prelats then it is, (as to any power of *deciding truths*, or *making Laws*,) that this *Body* is called a *Representative*, and not in respect of the multitude, that is subject to their Orders, and obliged to receive their commands; And it is called a *Representative* of these absent Church-Colleagues, not so, as if this Body, residing in the Council, had no authority, but held from them, (the authority of both being equal); or, as if they needed, for their own Session there, an *Commission*, or warrant from the rest, when as indeed the absents need rather a *Dispensation* from them, where all, being lawfully summoned by their spiritual Superiors, out of the duty they owe to them, ought to be present, and for absence are liable to their mulcts; but only, as is said, for that several of them are deputed by these absents to present their vote and judgement in the things consulted on, which vote necessary occasions hinder them from delivering, there, themselves.

5ly. That, seeing this *Collection* of Prelats, especially in latter times, if we take the greatest that hath, or morally can be, amounteth but to a small number in comparison of the whole Body of Prelats of the whole *Universe*, therefore the resolutions of the absent, concerning matters to be defined, are declared either in *Provincial*, or other lesser meetings, before such Council; or, the things defined (which gives less trouble,) are afterward ratified, and accepted by these Absents, at least so far as to a *tacit consent*, or *non-contradiction* of the *Acts* of such Council of them conven'd, whereby, now, those *Acts* become most firm, & universally obliging.

Where it is also to be noted, That the prudence of the Bishops resident in such Councils, though they have not antecedently the formal consent of their Brethren remaining behind in the Provinces for every thing they define, yet doth usually take care to regulate their definitions according to the common, clear, known, Tradition of the Church Doctors, both of former, and present times; (present, and former Tradition, as well for the sense of Scriptures as for others things not mentioned in Scripture, being the great director of their proceedings, according the ancient Rule of Pope *Seven, Nihil innovetur*). Tradition, I say, either of the Conclusion it self that is decided; or of the Principles, whence it is clearly deduced; And, observable also, that the same Bishops do abstain from determining any thing, wherein they know Catholick Divines are much divided; and where any doubt is of a non-concurrence therein, of either all, or most, of their absent Colleagues. This division of judgments hinting to them, both that there is more obscurity, and uncertainty of the Truth of such a Point; and less necessity of its being known; and they generally apprehend themselves only to be Guardians of the current Tradition, not discoverers of any new Science.

And such a proceeding Dr. *Stillingfleet* observes in the Fathers of the Council of Trent, where he (pervertily transforming their Christian wisdom into humane subtilty, and guilty fear) saith †—*That by this Council much care was taken, in many of its decrees, to pass them in such general terms, that each party might finde their sense in them; and that they were fearful of declaring themselves, for fear of disobliging a particular party.* Thus he. Which, drawn in fairer colours, is only to say: That this Council, without descending to a compliance with particular opinions, did in its decrees establish only those doctrines, which were generally delivered; and agreed on, by the learned of those Churches, which they there represented.

§. 27.

6ly. Yet, that this ratification of absent Ecclesiastical Governors is not held necessary as to all particular persons, or Churches (for neither, had all these absents been present in the Council, is the vote of every one there necessary for passing an Act,) or further, than a moderately major part of them. To which major part with the See Apostolick, as in the Council, so by the same reason out of the Council, the rest of Prelats, and Churches are obliged to conform, in their judgment, and in the—*Idem sapientes, id ipsum sentientes, in eadem permanentes regula; non prudentes apud semetipsas*, which is so often inculcated by the Apostle †; that there may be no Schism, but eternal Unity, and peace, in this Catholick Body. As for the remainder of the Church dis-

susive,

† Philip. 2. 3.

--3. 16.

Rom. 12. 16.

fufive, (the Laity; or alfo fome degrees of inferior Clergy;) as they have no authority to fit here, as members; fo neither have they, to confirm, or refufe, the acts of this fupreme Court; but are tyed with an *obedire, & fubjacere propofitio*. Heb. 13. 17. to fubmit to their decrees, and obey their injunctiions to fuch a degree as they are required.

And thus do vanifh thofe fancies.—¹ Of every General Council's receiving a Commiffion (to make its meeting authentick) from fome formal act, or tacit confent of the Church diffufive: ² of the affiftance of infallibility (if any fuch received) to be made over to it by affignment from the Church diffufive; ³ of its acting, not by any divine right, but only humane delegation; and, ⁴ of the feverd al parts of the Church being obliged to its decrees, by their choice, and confent only, not upon neceffity. A fcheme or Model of a General Council which as it is *totocalo* different from what Chrift hath drawn, and his Church practifed, fo could it not eafily have entered into the Head of any thus to mifhape a Convention of fo many Reverend and learned Fathers, whom God hath thought fit to fet over his Family to give them their Meat in due feafon, but by being too much acquainted with that late fer-vile way of the Presbyterian Affemblies doing journey-work under a Rebellious Parliament.

Urbe, quam dicunt Roman—putavi Hinc Nofta fimilem—

3ly. Again: It is asked: how fuch an *Ecclefiaftical* infallibility as is placed in a General Council, can be faid to be ferviceable, or at leaft neceffary, to the Church; which fubfifted, for the firft 300. years, without any fuch infallible Guide? And it is asked alfo; by what *infallible Guide*, in the long intervals of thefe Councils, Chriftians are fecured? Q. 3.
§. 98.
See D. Stil.
p. 258.
And Dr. Pierce
Anfw. to
Creffy. p. 6.
§. 99.

To the firft I anfwer; That this infallibility or *Inevrabiliry* in *Necessaries* accompanies the Clergy, and preserves the Church in all times, and did fo in the three firft Centuries; being annexed to the whole Body, or much major part of this Clergy, not only when met in a General Council, (which fuppofition the Objection proceeds upon,) but out of it alfo, whenever, and however, they fhall mantle a concurrence in their Judgment, and Agreement in their doctrine; Whether it be, by feveral Provincial Councils afsembled; all, or the moft of them, concurring in the fame fentence, or perhaps only by fome one Provincial Council convened in the place more infefted with fome new and dangerous error; which Council afterward hath the ratification of the chief Paftor of the Church, together with his Council, and hath the tacit approbation, or non-contradiction of other co-ordinate Churches.

¶ *Epilog. l.*
c. 8. p. 54.

whether by their *Communicatory* and *Synodical* Letters, in the hindrance of greater Assemblies. Or whether in their publick *Liturgies* and *Offices*; Or in a General Consent in their publick *Writings*, *Catechismes* and *Explications* of Christian-Doctrine. In none of which, as to *Doctrine Necessarie*, the whole Body of the Clergy; or that which, in any dissent, is to be accepted for the whole, shall ever err. Of this matter thus Mr. *Thorndike* || (speaking of the times before *Constantine*)—*The daily intercourse, in civility, and correspondence between Churches, without these Assemblies of Representatives we call Councils, was a thing so visibly practised by the Catholick Church from the beginning, that thereupon, I conceive, it may be called a standing Council, in regard of the continual settling of troubles arising in some part, and tending to question the peace of the whole, by the consent of other Churches concerned, [which settlement was] had and obtained by means of this mutual intelligence, and correspondence. The holding of Councils being a way of far greater dispatch; but the express consent of Churches, obtained upon the place, being a more certain foundation of peace, &c.*

To the second I answer, That this Body of the Clergy, that remaineth in all times, if, in the Interval of Councils, any new *Error*, dangerous to the faith, and not formerly condemned by any such Council, doth afflict the Church, is vigilant, by some of these wayes aforementioned, (wherein it is unerrable) as the times afford convenience, to suppress it. So was *Pelagianism* crushed, without a General Council, by several Provincial ones, and the joint Declarations of the Chief Prelates of the Catholick-Church. But if an error formerly condemned and crushed by a General Council begin to reexalt itself and grow again; There needs no more to quell it than that the same Governours, within their several Circuits do put in execution the former *unerring* Decrees of those Councils. In both therefore the present Church-Guides are secure from Error in any Necessaries; whilst, in respect of Errors fore-condemned, they adhere to, and follow, the definitions of former Councils: in new ones raised, which are thought any way to hazard the Christian faith, they unite afresh their common Judgment in some of the foresaid wayes, as times permit; either in one General, or several inferiour, Synods, or other Intelligence, or Correspondences of Churches, such, as may be equivalent to those Assemblies, which are more Oecumenical.

Q. 4.
§. 100.

4y. Again it is asked: How Lawfull General Councils can be maintained, all, unerring; which Councils experience hath shewed to have contradicted one another?—*Councils against Councils*

Councils (saith Mr. Chikinsw. ||) *Popes against Popes: Councils confirmed by Popes against Councils confirmed by Popes: Lastly, the Church* [i.e. Catholick or Univerfall] *of some ages against the Church of other ages.* || p. 131.

To which I answer; That they, who say so, cannot prove the things whereof they accuse this Sacred Mother, and her highest Courts; but either oppose some Inferiour Council to a General one; or take some Council to be a lawfull General one, that is not accounted so in the Judgment of the present Church-Catholick, as this Church-Catholick is stated before §. 11. 12. and in 2. Disc. §. 23 &c. Or take some of their Definitions to contradict, which do not so in the judgment of the present Church-Catholick: giving to these Definitions a different sense from theirs. Or, (which is most frequent), urge things held indeed by a considerable part of the Church in severall ages diversly; but, in no age, defined. But, if the judgment of the Church in this matter ought to be preferred before that privat one of these rash censurers, the utterly denies such contradiction in matters of faith to be in any of the General Councils, that she receives.

sly. Again it is asked: If a *General Council* should err in the defining of something *not necessary*, and again, if it can be proved, that no exact distinction can be made of such *non-necessaries* from *necessaries*, how, then, any Christian can be secure, for any particular point of his faith, that both such Council, and himself, do not err in it?

Q. 5.
§. 101.

I answer. 1st. That, if what is supposed here should be granted, yet still such Christian, as believes all the Council proposeth, is secure, that his faith is deficient in nothing necessary. And, Protestants think the like security sufficient in their own faith. For they, because holding the sense of Scripture clear even to the unlearned in all necessities, and believing all the Scripture faith, though they cannot exactly distinguish necessary points therein from others, yet affirm, their faith to be secure, because this faith actually not erring in any point clear; and so also, not in any point necessary.

2ly. That, as to the *Principal* points of faith called necessary, they are both, by Councils, sufficiently discerned from non-necessaries, and proposed as necessities; and so by Christians believed as such: In these particulars, therefore, they are certain of their not erring; and, as to other points of their faith, it is sufficient for Christians to know; that, if necessary, they do not err in them; though, which in particular are necessary, and, so certainly not erred in, they know not.

But meanwhile do those,

those, who urge, thus, an uncertainty in the faith of Catholicks in attaching their judgment to *Councils*, which in *not necessities* are supposed liable to error, make (themselves) any better provision for the *Protestants faith*, in remitting them, from Councils, unto their own judgments; which, in necessities also, they grant, are liable to error; at least, upon their not using due industry, their being swayed by passion, interest, &c. which every humble man, surely, will suspect himself of sooner, than a Council?

Q. 6.
§. 102.

6ly. Again. It is much pressed; That, upon the pretence, that a *General Council* is *infallible*, no error of such Council can ever be corrected, or remedied, neither by a particular person or Church; nor yet by another Council General.

Answer: If the Council be, as it is pretended, infallible, no need of correcting an error, where is none. If it be fallible; yet if so, only in non-necessaries; no great harm, if Christians in such a point be misled; but great, if, private men throwing off this Guide upon such pretence, they should so come, in some necessary point, to miscarry. But indeed, for General Councils to be fallible in necessities also; this I grant would be a thing most mischievous to the Church: but, that they shall never thus err, see what is said before §. 6. & Disc. 1. §. 7, 14, & 59. And indeed, the objection here, i. e. the ruine, which such error would bring upon Christianity; (considering the obedience commanded by God to these Councils) is a sufficient Argument, that thus they never err; nor consequently, need reformation.

§. 103.

Yet, meanwhile those men who urge this; that the *error* of a General Council; in such an universal obligation of belief to it, can never be *rectified*, or reformed, consider not; That, on the other side, in admitting a reformation by Inferiors, or any its supposed errors, no truth can be firmly established; and that, before one error will so be amended; many truths, whilst its definitions are exposed to the trial of every private fancy, will be perverted; and that it is much the better of the two, that some error [in *non-necessaries*] remain unremedied, than that no truth [in *necessaries*] stand fixed, and confirmed. Again, since all persons, for the truth of such things wherein the sense of Scripture is controverted, must if they will not profess themselves Scepticks, and ought to acquiesce in some ultimate Judge, or other, though liable to error; let those then, who reject a General Council, name what other ultimate Judge they will chuse, rather. I suppose, here, they will blush to name themselves for that Judge; neither can they have any reason to name either any other single person, or yet inferior

rior

rior Council to be that Judge, against a General. Lastly, The same difficulty and hazard may be charged upon the Protestant's ground of the certainty of his faith [†] viz. *Because the sense of* [†] See Disc. 2. §. 38. *by Scripture is clear in all necessities, so all using ordinary industry to understand it. For now supposing, that indeed the sense of Scripture should not be clear in some necessary, and so such Protestant (solely guided by and building upon it) using his industry yet should err, in some such point; such error of his is no way to be rectified, so long as he maintains this ground. A thing observed by Mr. Thorndike, Just Weights, c. 21. p. 137.*

7ly, Again it is asked: whether a lawful General Council be affirmed infallible only with, or also without, the concurrence of, and confirmation of its decrees by, the Bishop of Rome?

To which (waving here, what testimony may be produced from Scripture, and the Exposition of Antiquity, concerning St. Peter's supremacy, and the Bishop of Rome's succeeding in it elsewhere examined). 1st. I answer in the words of the Apostle [†] 1 Cor. 11. 16. (standing upon the Church's custom) in another matter: That the Churches of God alwayes have had such a custom to define nothing in faith without, or against, the consent of this Successor of Saint Peter, and Bishop of the prime Apostolick See; and that this hath been constantly delivered by their Tradition. See the ancient Canon concerning this [*Sine Romano Pontifice nihil faciendum*]; * urged by Julius not long after the Council of Nice (in his Epistle recited by Athanasius Apol. 2.) against the Oriental Arian Bishops: slighting his authority; * urged by Innocentius (and August. Ep. 91.) * mentioned by Socrates l. 2. c. 13. — by Sozomen, l. 3. c. 9. And it is remarkable, that in the times that those, acknowledged by all, capital, errors (which are now suppressed in the Athanasian Creed) troubled the Church, though all the other chief Patriarchs were tainted with (and his Faith failed not) one or other of them; yet the Bishop of Rome alwayes stood firm; and the Church, in her vote, always joyned with his Chair, though divided from some of the other. If the Act of Liberius be here objected, see what is answered to it. Disc. 2. §. 26 n. 4.

And, seeing this Prime Patriarch of the Church-Catholick presides in General Councils [†], as the Metropolitan doth in Provincial, therefore, as [†] See before, §. 186. the Canons ordered concerning Provincial Councils — *Ut nihil præter Metropolitanum conscientiam gerant, &c. sic enim unanimitas erit*: (Apostol. can. 5. — Contil. Antioch. can. 9.) so there seems the same equity, that neither the General Councils should pass any acts without the consent of the Roman

Bishop.

Wishop, their President, and Head. But 2^{ly}. So long as no Councils are pressed upon Protestants, for lawfully General, or infallible, save only such, which this Prime Patriarch hath alwayes consented to, and confirmed, this question, whether the Acts of such Councils may stand good, or their authority be infallible, without his consent, may be superseded.

The former Query thus resolv'd,

Q. 8.
§. 105.

8. Again, it is asked upon this: How the *Pope's Confirmation* of its decrees can concur to the *not erring* of such a Council, since his Confirmation follows the Councils final decision? For now if it hath erred, such Definition is erroneous, though he approves it; if not erred, it is Orthodox [and so may be safely accepted] though he rejects it †.

† Dr. Pierce
Answ. to
Cressy. p. 17.
--Stillin^g fl.
p. 59.

I answer; his *Confirmation* secures us, that the Council errs not, (or the Council never errs, when he confirms it); because, supposing that the rest of the Council should decree an error, the Grace of God, or the *Holy Ghost* assists this Holy Father, and Prime Patriarch of the Church-Catholick, President of these Councils so, as that it effectually hinders him (after what manner, or by what means it pleaseth) that he doth never confirm it, lest so the whole Church should be misguided in something necessary. Or again, when he perhaps would (left to himself) confirm an error, the same *Holy Spirit* assists the Council so, (by what ways of the Divine Wisdom it matters not) that they do not define it. And thus the Council never erreth, being confirmed by him; either, because its decree is Orthodox; or, his consent withheld. Hence then, if the decrees be erroneous, he never approves; if Orthodox, he safely approves them.

Q. 9.
§. 106.

9. Again it is asked; if the Council not secure from erring without the *Pope's* approbation; nor again, the *Pope* without the assistance of a Council, in which of the two the infallibility, or not erring, resides? For in which soever we shall place it, it renders the other useless. And, if in both,* then also either of them is sufficient: Such Qualities being indivisible, and without integral Parts. It is also enquired by a late Protestant-Bishop (||—Whether the members of this Council pretended Infallible, are all to be of the Communion of Saints or may be only a mixt Body of some Good some Bad? If they must be the first, then none can know, they are such an infallible Guide; since though their persons are visible, their distinctive cognisance [their sanctity] is invisible. But if they may be the latter, then no Ground is left to pronounce them Infallible. For—the promise of the Infallible Spirit, the Spirit

|| Bp. Taylor
Disswasive
part. 2. p. 19,
23.—See
also Stillin^g.
p. 122.

rit of Truth, was never made to any save the Communion of Saints, and those who are living Members of Christs Body.

To the first part, I answer: where is supposed the consent of both in a truth, the actual non-erring lies in both: But the Original cause of this not erring may be sometimes in the one, and sometimes in the other, (as also erring may be in either, separated) as they are by the Holy Ghost more effectually illuminated, or guided so, as in the last question is explained.

To the 2d I answer. That this infallible Guide may be always, and probably for the most part is, the latter. That Infallibility, or an Illumination in and knowledge of all necessary Divine Truths, is to be placed amongst the Graces of the Holy Ghost *gratis data*, though not also *gratum facientes*; And that these two are not unoften separated from one another. See. 1. Cor. 12. 8, 11. — *To one is given the Word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge* &c. by the self-same Spirit, dividing severally to every man, as he will. And c. 13. 2. — Particularly, it is supposed — That a Person may prophecy and understand all Mysteries and all knowledge, and do all miracles to confirm them, and yet be void of Charity, or the Sanctification of the Spirit. Infallibility is indeed a promise made to the Church, i. e. to the external Communion of Saints in appearance, within which external Communion is contained the Internal, known only to God: And again, In this external Communion made, not to all, but to the Clergy, i. e. persons by an external solemn Ordination set apart for the Church's Guides, but not only to the sanctified amongst these (known only to God): For so, No Pastours could teach Gods Truths, that were not also Saints. Plain things, which it is strange this Bishop did not consider, or else sought to conceal, and darken with misty expressions. I had thought the confounding of the External Church-Authority with the Internal Communion of Saints had been long since exploded.

CHAP. X.

10. Q. If General Councils infallible; whether they are so in their conclusions only? which infers Enthusiasm, or new Revelation. Or also in their premises and proofs? upon which, assent will be due to all their Arguments as well as Decrees? §. 107.

11. Q. Why, being infallible at least in their conclusions, they do not end all controversy, but leave so many unresolved? §. 108.

12. *Q.* How such infallibility of theirs differs from that of the Apostles? And the infallibility of their Decrees, from that of Scripture? §. 109.
13. *Q.* How many persons, or Guides, all fallible, can make up one infallible? §. 112.
14. *Q.* Supposing all lawful General Councils infallible; yet, how can any one know infallibly, which are lawful General Councils? The reason, Because so many conditions are required truly to make them such; in some one or other of which conditions, one can never be infallibly certain of any Council, that it hath not failed. §. 114.

Q. 10.
§. 107.

10. *A* Gain; it is asked: If a lawful General Council be not liable to error, whether it is so, in its *Definitions*, and *Conclusions* only, or in the *Premises* also, and its right deduction of the Conclusion from them?

I answer; That it is not necessary, that it should be free from error, save in the Definition, or conclusion only; [which I say, not as denying sufficient former *Revelations*, and *Tradition*, whereon to ground every conclusion, that hath been passed in any Council; nor, that such Revelation, and Tradition is unknown to the Council; but only, that, for the Council's not erring in the Conclusion, this is not necessary, that all the Principles, or all the reasoning it useth, be infallible, and certain.] If it be demanded; how it is possible, that the Council should be infallible, or actually unerring, (for this is all that is meant), in the Conclusion, when fallible, or erring in the making *Premises*, or *deductions*?

I answer: Because the Holy Ghost assists them that they should always conclude right; and this, from some principles never failing: Though some other principle or Reason, whereby they go about to prove, or confirm such a conclusion, be not solid. I say some principle, for, since the same conclusion is provable by many several *Mediums*, or Arguments; or also the Conclusion, or Definition it self may descend by express Tradition, and not be extracted only out of some former traditive Principle, by deduction, it cannot be shewed, that any Council hitherto hath failed in either of these, viz: ' in the delivering a proposition as express Tradition, that was not so; or, ' in the deducting it from principles, none of which are true, or Traditional. Nor are we certain, that more Arguments, or Reasons were not used by any such Council, than those only, that are transmitted in the Records of such Councils to posterity. Nor do I see, who are sufficient Judges of the misarguings of Councils, unless it be some following Council of the same Authority. It cannot be denied also, that the Holy Ghost may preserve the

the Church in all necessary Truth, by inspiring and illuminating their understandings in, and exciting the adherence of their will to, such Truth, when they are mistaken in some of the rational evidence they think they have for it. By *illuminating them*, I say, after the same ordinary manner in the Council; as them, or others, out of it: only this assistance, here, is *constant*, to a competent number, (and they are *disposed rightly* for it) in this supreme Ecclesiastical Court, for the *necessities* of the Church; whereas, out of the Council, the same persons, when some way indisposed thereto, often fail of it.

But in the last place, if it be asked; how *they*, or *others* can *know*, that they do not err in the Conclusion, where their premises, or their deduction is supposed erroneous?

I answer; 1st. That where some Deduction is erroneous, yet they may know they do not err, either from Tradition of the Conclusion, or the certainty of other premises, or evident deduction, used. 2ly. That, indeed, they cannot truly be *certain* of their conclusion by this way *viz.* from their *arguing*, if it be not right; or from the *Principle* they use, if this uncertain, or false; but yet they may be certain of their Conclusion still by another way: *i.e.* from Christs promises, if he hath engaged to them (as he hath) a not erring therein; and the confidence of their infallibility lies in this latter, not alwayes in the former, which perhaps may be discovered sometimes to fail: In the first Council (Act. 15.) there was much reasoning *pro*, and *con* (*magna conquisitio*, v. 15.) and some reasoning that was amiss; and yet to their Conclusion was prefixed a—*Visum est Spiritui Sancto*. And so also (as Bishop Sales ||)—*After the Council's Determination once pronounced, || Of divine Every one doth therein fully rest, and quiet themselves, not in consideration of the reasons alledged in the precedent Discussion, and inquisition, but in virtue of the Holy Ghost's Authority, who presiding invisibly in these Councils doth judge and determine and conclude by the Mouths of his servants whom he hath established the Pastors of Christianity.* 14. §. 3.

II. Again it is asked: Why, if these Councils be indeed secure of not erring, at least in their Conclusions, they do not straightways determine all Controversies, some of which seem necessary to be so determined, because of the great trouble they give the Church? and particularly; why the Council of *Trent* left so many unresolved, that were agitated not only before, but also in that very Council, by its own members?

I answer, Because they have a promise of divine assistance, not in deciding *any* point controverted, but only those *necessry*.

And, again, they judge necessary to be decided only those points, whereof they have a former *Revelation* and *Tradition* descended to them (for, in all necessities, by the divine providence, these two fail them not); a *Revelation*, I say, and *Tradition* thereof either in the formal *Conclusion* it self, or in its necessary *Principles*.

In the considering of which Principles, and deductions, though the Guides are sometimes liable to mistakes; yet the divine promise, and superintendency, first never suffers them to err in the matter that is concluded from them; or also never suffers them to err in *all* those principles (when they attempt by these to prove some tradition) from which it may be concluded, (as hath been mentioned in the last Reply), whilst they pass not beyond the settling of those doctrines, which are necessary for the edification of this Church; Nor yet 2ly. suffers them to pass these bounds of resolving necessities, so far, as to burden the Church's *faith* with curiosities. And this union of the divine direction, together with humane reasoning, may be observed in the very first Council, held *Act. 15*, but now mentioned. Where the assistance of the Holy Ghost is applied to all, or to the major part of those, that sat in Council, and concurred in making the decree, not only to the Apostles; and is found well to consist with the great reasoning, and disputing used there before the last resolution—*Cum autem magna conquisitio fieret* Vers. 7. —And yet—*Visum est Spiritui Sancto & nobis.* Vers. 28.

There are therefore two sorts of Controversies, which these supreme Courts ordinarily dismiss unresolved: the one sort, out of necessity: namely those, whereof they find no certain former *Revelation*, or *Tradition*: whence, with good reason, they conclude also the *knowledge* of them not necessary: the other voluntarily: such as appear to them of *sufficient evidence* indeed, but *small consequence*.

Q. 12.
§. 109.

12. Again; it is asked: How such infallibility of lawful *General Councils* doth any way differ from that of the *Apostles*? or that of their *decrees* from the holy *Scriptures*?

I answer: That whatever decrees of Councils are true, they are as true, as the *Scriptures*; and in whatever the Church-Guides are infallible or unerring, they are as infallible in it, as the *Apostles* (for one truth is no truer, than another): but that this their infallibility, as to several circumstances thereof, compared with the *Apostles*, is much inferior.

1st. In that it is not extended so far for its matter, as that of the *Apostles*; they being infallible in *all* they delivered, these only,

only in their *Conclusions*, or *Definitions*.

2ly. In that, though sometimes the reason, why these Fathers do not err in such a Definition, may be, not their necessary deduction of it from an infallible Principle, but the inspiration, illumination, immediate assent of faith, or some other way of operation of God's Spirit at that time, upon them, in such manner, as it works on other Christians, whenever it opens their minds, and makes them understand a truth, beyond the rational arguments they have, or humane industry they use, to attain it: yet such *inspiration* of Councils in this differs from that of the Apostles; that, as the Council collects not this their infallibility from any unfailable argumentations, that are alwayes made by them concerning such particular Conclusion: so neither do they collect it from any such inspiration, which they *sensibly* perceive; nor from any *express testimony*, that the Spirit gives within them to such its operation, as the Apostles did; but only, in general, from the *Divine Promise*, that in all such *Conclusions* they shall never miscarry.

§. 110.

3ly. The Church's infallibility differs from the Apostolical, in that it is an inspiration, or revelation (if you will), not of any new Doctrine, but of such, as was, in its principles at least, formerly revealed, and delivered by Christ or his Apostles; and therefore the knowledge thereof, (if at any time it was not), might be, attained by deduction from those Principles, without any new inspiration, and is actually had in the Church still, either from such true Principle, or by *Tradition* of the Conclusion itself. And, to end this question; let them who ask it consider: in what manner the Church-Catholick diffusive is for ever preserved infallible in necessities (a thing they affirm) without its equalling infallibility Apostolical. And I answer; her General Councils are so too. To the other part of the Query, I answer; In what sort, their infallibility equals not the Apostles, so neither that of their decrees that of Scripture.

§. 111.

13. Again; it is asked: † How many persons, or Guides, all *infallible*, can make up one *infallible*; any more than many Planets one Sun; or many acts of finite knowledge, one, truly infinite?

Q. 13.

§. 112.

† Dr. Pierce

Answ. to

Cressy p. 9.

I answer 1st. with another question: How the *whole diffusive Body* of the Church, that consists of many members all fallible, or failible in necessities, yet is affirmed by Protestants, that it shall be for ever infallible, or unfailable in necessities? 2ly. That, *Infallible* being understood, as it is meant; i.e. for the Church's

Church's *actually* never erring, at such time; in such a meeting; and treating on such matters; the question is no more than this: How several persons erring in one thing, may be non-erring in any, or in another, thing? Or how the same persons, when met together, and divinely assisted in the matters they consult about, do not, or shall not err, when the same persons in the same things, at some other time, when not consulting together, and having no certain divine assistance promised to them, may, and ordinarily do err? And it is answered, that this is effected by the good pleasure of God divinely assisting and preserving them in such meeting, in such matters, from error.

† D. Pierce
Ib. p. 11.

It is also urged †, That though Councils indeed may actually not err (as single persons also may not); yet that there is a great difference between the Participle [suppose *non fallans*, or *non falsus*] and the Adjective in *bilis* [*non fallibilis*]. I answer whatever difference there be between Participles, and Adjectives; no more is here meant by the second, than by the first, only with a *semper* added to it, viz. *Ecclesia infallibilis*, i.e. *semper non falsa* [If I may use this word]: *inerrabilis*, i.e. *semper non errans*; or *de facto nunquam errans*. Now, though particular members of the Church are also unerring in several things, yet not alwayes; and though this that God may preserve single persons unerring alwayes is true; yet that he doth so, is denied of them, but affirmed of the Church, or lawful General Council, as to all necessities. Is it not strange, that grave Divines (rather than be found without a reply) should thus raise misis, and make great difficulties, and fall on vindicating the divine Attributes, in such a matter as this, intelligible to children? who, surely one day, must give account hereof.

§. 113.

After all these objections, and difficulties, made concerning the infallibility, or not erring of *lawful General Councils*, Next, supposing, that all such are, as to all necessary faith, an infallible Guide; and all the former difficulties concerning this point clearly removed: yet a new roll of objections, and interrogations is brought in, against our discerning, or knowing certainly, *what*, or *how many* of *past Councils* have been *lawfully General*, which latter not cleared, the first, though manifest, is unserviceable.

Q. 14.

§. 114.

|| *Consulting w. p.*
93, &c.

— *Stillingsf.*

P. 539, &c.

— 123, &c.

Whitby p. 430,
&c.

14. Next then it is urged ||; That, *lawful General Councils* only being pretended *infallible*, Any, to be certain of any particular Council its not erring, and so, to yield his assent to its decrees as such, must know first; whether it is a *lawful General Council*. And, for this again must know: who are justly the constitutive members of such a body? whether, *Bishops* only, or also *Presbyters*, or also the *Lay*, (as, in *Act*. 15. 22, 23. the *Brethren* also are admitted

ted) ? whether the votes therein ought to be numbred according to the *persons* ; or rather, to the severall *Churches*, and *Nations* ; the greater Churches having many times in the Synod the fewer representatives ; and so fewer personal votes ? ⁴ whether the Bishops sitting therein were *lawful* Bishops ? and, in order to this, whether first, truly *Priests*, and truly *baptized* ? and whether some of these Sacraments had no miscarriage, for want of the Priest's due intention in administering them ? ⁵ whether a *sufficient number* of Bishops present in it, and those equally from all parts, so to make it a full and entire representative of the Church Catholick ? and ⁶ whether the *Pope's summons* thereto be sufficient ? [though this question seems needlessly asked for all those Councils, in the convening of which both the Pope, and the most of Christian Princes have concurred.] ⁷ whether the Bishops, appearing in Council, were *sufficiently commissioned* from those Churches they pretend to represent ? and ⁸ whether *sufficiently instructed*, as to the points to be decided, concerning the sense therein of the absent Bishops of such Church first declared in their *Provincial*, or other, *Synods*, or meetings ? and ⁹ whether those sent to the Council did *truly speak*, and render this their sense ? Being lawfully assembled, ¹⁰ whether they have also *lawfully proceeded* ? whether they came to the Council *without prejudice*, and sought nothing but the truth (otherwise, they are not gathered together in *Christ's name* ; and then, neither is he in the midst of them) ? ¹¹ whether a *faction*, or some few (more powerful) have not *out-witted*, or *over-awed* the rest ? and ¹² whether some were not *corrupted*, or *bribed* to give their vote against conscience ? Being lawfully assembled, and lawfully proceeding, ¹³ What be their *Definitions* ; and How many ? whether they *made* indeed *such decrees*, as are pretended theirs ? ¹⁴ what of these decrees are *de fide*, what not ? ¹⁵ whether these decrees have that *meaning* really, which the peruser of them apprehends ? for, since the *Scriptures*, in deciding of Controversies, are doubtful, & liable to wrong interpretations, why may not the *decrees of Councils* be so too ? Nay, much more ? for we have many other places to compare, the help of original tongues, and the help of the primitive Church, to understand Scripture by : when the decrees of Councils are many times purposely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous expressions to give satisfaction to some dissenting parties. [Thus they argue : As if they should say ; If the Law cannot be understood by us, much less the Judge that is appointed to explain it, for also we have many Comments on the Law ; none, on his Sentence : or, as if the sense of those many Canons of Councils, that are urged against Protestants, were not granted by them, both *sufficiently clear*, and
accused.

† *Stillingsf.*
p. 513.

† p. 125.

accused by them as *evidently erroneous*]. Lastly, ¹⁶ whether their decrees have been *confirmed by the Pope* ? And then, for this, it must be known also, ¹⁷ whether the *Pope*, confirming them, was a *lawful Pope*, * whether not *Simoniacally elected* ? [which but once hapning, there follows from it the illegality of all his Successors ; because these chosen by some Cardinals, that were created by him, who are no legitimate Electors ; and upon this account (saith Dr. Stillingfleet †) there hath been no legal Pope since Sixtus the Fifth]. And here again return all these questions, concerning the *Pope's Baptism, Ordination, &c.* with a *right intencion* of the Priest in doing them, which were asked formerly concerning the Bishops.

These, and many more (such like) Queries are made by persons studying acuteness in their throwing down the Pillars of a former settled faith, to make way for introducing a more free, and unconfined, (i. e. a more sceptical, and arbitrary, or latitudinarian) Religion. And, since from any one of these Queries a quarrel may be commenced against a *Council*, as not *lawful* ; there will never want, for any past Council, some pretence or other, of disallowing it, when it states Doctrines, or gives Laws, contrary to our inclination, or interest ; and how easie were it for a *Socinian*, from several of these, to quarrel with that of *Nice* ? (See below Disc. 4. §. 18. &c.) and lastly, what may we expect, but a reviving also of all the ancient Heresies, in such an uncertainty of the legalness of those Councils that condemned them ?

§. 115.

To all which I return this answer : 1st. That a *not possibly fallible*, certainty, or assurance, of the lawfulness of any Council, or of the forementioned particulars, whereby this lawfulness may be known, is by no side affirmed necessary.

2ly. That, as for a *non-morally fallible* certainty, in respect of several of the particulars, [such as these, whether all the Bishops, that sat in the Council of *Nice* (or Pope that confirmed it,) were truly & lawfully baptized, ordained, &c. none simoniacally elected, none come to the Council with prejudice, none corrupted, or over-awed in giving his vote, &c.] this is sufficient, that, where any of these things do fail the cognizance of Tradition, yet any Christian, in general, may be rationally assured (I mean, as to the *much major part* of such Council, for more needs not,) that that divine providence, and assistance, which is supposed to preserve the Church Diffusive from failing, and its lawful General Councils from *not erring* in necessities, doth consequently, either preserve such Councils, as are taken by this Church for lawfully general, from all such *defects*, as do render them not capable of this promise of *not-erring* : Or, if any forepassed Councils, reputed lawfully General,

General, have had such defects, doth continue the same privilege of *not erring* also to these Councils, because such their defects are undiscernable to the Church. Otherwise, the Church's error, in *not discerning* lawful Councils, would render the divine favour, in *assisting* lawful Councils, useless, and unbeneficial unto her.

And this answer is no more, than is thought reasonable, and is given, by Protestants in other cases. So Mr. *Chillingworth*, † §. 116.
p. 78. upon a doubt proposed; whether a *Penitent* doing his own best endeavours, when absolved of his sins, by one that goes for, but really is no Priest, or by a Priest, but without an intention of absolving him, receives any benefit thereby, thinks this a good answer: *That God's goodness will supply all such defects, as, to humane endeavours, were unavoidable. And therefore, though his Priest were indeed no Priest, yet to him he should be, as if he were one: and, if he gave absolution without intention, yet, in doing so, he should hurt himself only, not his Penitent.*—And Protestants (upon supposition that God hath, by no other way than by Scripture, clearly revealed the points necessary to salvation) do, from the same goodness of God, prove this their fundamental Doctrine; viz: that all necessities to salvation are clearly revealed in Scripture; where, as I conceive the supposition to fail, so, the arguing good, upon the common Principle: that, *Deus non deficit in necessariis*.

3ly. So far, as the former questions are moved concerning a sufficient certainty: I suppose Protestants will affirm; that they have a sufficient certainty concerning some Councils, that they were lawfully General: as; concerning the four first; whose Definitions also they retain in their Creed: what ground therefore of their certainty of these Councils (that they were lawfully General) they will return to a *Socinian* asking the former questions of them (whether this ground be a General Church-Tradition, or any thing else) the same may be returned to the same questions concerning the rest, that have been held lawfully General by the common Tradition of later times, since the siring of such Councils: But if Protestants upon the many scruples they have started will deny the sufficient certainty of the legalness of any Council at all, what remains, but that they reform the old Creeds (as the *Socinians* would have them) and that the Universally-receiv'd first Councils also be from henceforth repealed and laid aside?

4ly. I answer: That, for solution of the former questions, such as are more material (as touching the *sufficiency* of the representative; the *lawfulness* of their proceedings, the true Copy of their Decrees, their Confirmation by the See Apostolick; acception by

by the Church disapprove, such as is necessary &c.) private Christians have sufficient certainty from the testimony, that, after the sitting of such Councils, the *continued Tradition* of the Church Catholick, or of its Governors, taken in the sense explained before §. 8, 12 : &c. Disc. 2. §. 23. or also met in latter Councils, delivers thereof : in which tradition he may securely rest, and supersede that quest, for satisfaction of the former doubts, with which others must needs be much perplexed, who have not the humility to acquiesce in the resolutions of their forefathers.

§. 119. n. 1.

† 9. 2. 6.

gly. Since the Church-Catholick, (or its Governors, as stated before †) of *all ages*, and therefore that of the *present age*, is an infallible Guide in necessities ; therefore, whatever former Councils, and their definitions, the present Church, or its Governors do accept, and own, Christians may be assured from this, that such Councils have not erred in necessities ; and either were lawfully general and obliging, or at least, by this acceptance of the present Church, are rendered equivalent thereto ; the act of this Church her allowing their decrees being of the same strength, and vigor, as is her new decreeing them. And thus ; for such Councils, the former enquiries become frustrated. Note, that I understand the acceptance of the present Church-Catholick, or its Governors, in the sense explained before §. 11. &c. & Disc. 1. §. 38.

§. 119. n. 2.

6. But, lastly ; though a Christian, by these wayes, may have a sufficient certainty concerning what, or how many, have been lawful General Councils, or equivalent thereto : and so, concerning their decrees : yet it is not affirmed by *Catholic* : that either a non-possibly, or a non-morally, fallible certainty of these Councils, or of their Decrees or Definitions, is necessary to *all persons*, for the attaining a *divine* and *salutifical* belief of all the necessary articles of their Faith. Of which see below, §. 129. n. 3. Provided, that every one be rightly disposed to believe, both concerning Councils, and their Decrees, what is, or shall be, by his Superiors sufficiently proposed to him ; without, and before, which proposal, he may be not only not infallibly certain, but without perill to Salvation ignorant, (supposing his Profession of the Common Creeds ; and, that these do contain all Articles that are necessary *necessitate Medii* to be believed), both, what Councils are lawfully General ; and, what such General Councils have decreed.

For, though all the Definitions of such lawful Councils are supposed, in some kind, necessary to some, or other : yet some are necessary to be explicitly known to one, that are not so to another :

ther: and there lies no obligation on every one, or on most, to know them all; but only this, that, whenever they are sufficiently proposed to him, he do not dissent from them. Meanwhile, as for those publick Doctrines and Articles, the confession, and practice of which is more generally required, Christians, using a diligence suitable to their callings, may receive sufficiently certain and secure instruction, both concerning these, and the true sense of them, from their particular Spirituall Guides (if these are members of the Church-Catholick): These particular Catholick Guides being the less liable, to mistake, or to deceive them, because they do (no more than their disciples) proceed upon their own judgment; but hold themselves obliged to submit this to the common one of the Church; (a way of security of not erring themselves in what they teach others, which the Guides of all other Sects disclaime.) But yet; when any private person hath any suspicion of a misinformation from his immediate Pastor, (which is granted possible), he hath other superiour Guides, and these too ranked in a certain Subordination, whom to consult; and is obliged only to acquiesce in the supremest, which is secure from erring in any Necessaries, as is explained before §. 99. In which obeying of his Guides, God, who hath enjoined such obedience to be yielded to them, will never suffer him in Necessaries to be misled by them. This, a Catholick's course, this his Security; Neither, with the Protestant, questioning, and unfixing all former Church-authority in its most Generall Consults; nor, in his faithfull Obedience alwaies professed to this authority, too anxious of not being sufficiently informed of all its true Decrees and Injunctions, and their true sense, because to an explicit knowledg of all these, Decrees he stands no way obliged.

CHAP. XI.

Solution of the Question touching the Resolution of a Divine Faith.

Where,

1. That the Object of a Divine Faith is always in it self most infallibly true. §. 123.
2. 3. That Divine Faith always resolves it self into Divine Revelation as its proper Object, and that on which it chiefly depends and relies, as to a firm adherence to and confidence therein. §. 124. &c.

And that this Resolution must be into some one Revelation wherein it ultimately terminates and rests, as to any proof that can be thereof from any other Divine Revelation without a process in infinitum, or wheeling about in a Circle. §. 125. n. 2.

And that an Humane Tradition or Testimony is only an Introductive to a Divine Faith, no Object of it. §. 126.

4. 5. That such Divine Faith is always wrought in Christians by the operation of Gods Spirit. §. 127.

But that this Holy Spirit is no evidence or proof of the truth of such a Divine Faith either to others, or to our selves. §. 128.

Nor yet any supernatural assistance that may accompany the Motives. §. 129. n. 1.

6. That such a Divine Faith is also attainable without any extrinsecal infallible Introductive, or Proponent. Neither that it is necessary that all men, for having such a Divine and saving Faith, be first infallibly certain that the external Proponent thereof is infallible. §. 129. n. 3.

7. Yet that there is a Rational and sufficiently certain Ground or Proof produced for this Faith, (which relies as to its Object only on Divine Revelation), and for all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church, which no other Religion besides Christianity, nor no other Sect, or seducing private spirit in Christianity, can pretend to: viz. Tradition, as circumstantiated and qualified with the other commonly called Prudential Motives. §. 135. n. 1.

And that such a Rational Certainty or naturally infallible Ground of a Christians Faith, for this at least, that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and consequently whatever is contained therein, infallible, is affirmed by Protestants. §. 136.

But further; That the same Certainty as to the Infallibility of the Guides of the Church in necessities is affirmed by Catholics; as this clearly revealed both in Scripture, and by Tradition Apostolical: from which Infallibility of the Church, thus cleared to them, they retain a firm faith of all those other points that are not in Scripture, or by Tradition, as to all men so evidently revealed, as Church Infallibility is. In many of which points these others, who believe only Infallibility of Scripture, where its sense is doubtful are liable to miscarry. §. 140.

From the Precedents the Difficulties in the Objection cleared, and the Catholicks Resolution of Faith vindicated from being Circular. §. 143.

The Conclusion. Wherein, of the many advantages, of promoting their salvation lost by Protestants in persisting out of the Communion of the Roman Catholick Church, and rejecting the conduct of their Canonical Spiritual Guides. §. 144.

IN this Query which follows concerning the Resolution of Faith, wherein several Catholics do variously express themselves (according to their liberty of opinion, unrestrained by any former Church-definition), & where many of the terms have such a latitude of signification, as it is hard to speak so distinctly, as not in something to be misunderstood, I have purposely quoted several Catholic Authors of good note, in confirmation of what is deliver'd, to prevent all jealousy, that any thing is said here new, heterodox, or formerly censured by the Roman Church. I have also in this 2d Edition in some things enlarged the Discourse, in others altered the expressions, to remove several mistakes wherein it hath had the unhappiness to be much misunderstood, or at least misinterpreted, and amongst others most strangely by D. St. as any, lest I should seem to charge him causelessly, who pleases to examine them, may see in these two particulars.

The one is, that, when he had told his Reader in his Discourse, || that *D. Still: 2.*
R. H. had yielded up the cause in dispute, which surely must be by *Disc. p. 304.*
his saying, in this matter, the same thing with Protestants; Yet afterwards he tells him † that, after many turnings and windings, the Guide fits down at last in the grossest way of Resolving Divine Faith into the Testimony of the Holy Ghost. † p. 210
And that so, as—
Never was any thing more fully said to this purpose by the highest Calvinists or Enthusiasts. And so he spends several pages in confuting that way. Whereas R. H. concerning the Holy Spirit in respect of a Divine Faith, saith only this; That It is always the Efficient thereof by illuminating the Understanding and any knowledge, that is necessary thereto, wherein it may be defecting; and by working in the Will manytimes a firmer adherence to the Divine Revelations, than to the clearest Science; things which none, Catholics or Protestants, unless the Doctor will be excepted, do deny. But then adds, That either as to other men's, or our own knowledge, there the Faculty illuminations, or persuasions, which we have obtain'd in such a manner as a Divine Truth are truly the effect of this Faculty, and not of a seducing Spirit, this is learn'd (not from the Holy Spirit, or all manifesting to us that this our faith is his work, which only would have suited the Doctor's charge here, but from quite another thing, viz.) from Tradition, and other Motives, which do not intend to us such a Divine Revelation; and so that our belief of them, is but a manifest and requisite, in the work of God's Spirit, and hath none of its own evidence, but very frequently. For which the Reader may see his words at p. 48. where it is said—That the forementioned Motives which are a rational evidence of the verity of Christianity, and of the several Articles thereof, do serve for an introduction to us, as after it introduced for a confirmative of.

of this Divine Faith to make it credible, or acceptable to humane Reason, *my own, or others*, that this faith [as to its object] is true; and that I am assured in it by the Holy, and no seducing, Spirit.

Again §. 120. he saith—If asked, what Ground I have to think this is a perswasion of Gods, and not of some evil Spirit [i.e. as to the object of it] Here I urge for this the Prudential Motives. *Where he saith* *no*; I urge for this the Testimony within me of the same Spirit, that such and such are its operations in me; or such object of it; a Divine truth: this indeed would have been Enthusiasm; but argue quite the contrary, an External publick Evidence that such thing was believed to really a Divine Revelation and so a right belief of it is a perswasion that comes from Gods spirit.

Again, §. 125. he saith—That though many seducing Spirits do use to pretend and set up themselves for supporters of a Divine Faith, Yet that there are morally infallible Grounds or motives which ever remain a constant way of distinguishing [as to the matter and object of it] to the world, and to all mens reason, a true Divine Faith wrought by Gods Holy Spirit, from these counterfeit ones wrought by the evil Spirit. And that Catholicks for this Divine Faith, which the Holy Ghost only works in them as to such a supernaturall powerfull and civilisall efficacy thereof, yet alwaies have, besides this, many extrinsecal Motives and assurances to render it, I say not Divine, which such humane motives cannot do, but is reason credible and acceptable to themselves and others, which no false Religion, no false Faith can produce or lay claim to; I mean, the former Motives, which whereas the internall Plessphory of this faith wrought by the Spirit is not publickly conspicuous, or manifestive abroad, these Motives are a standing rational evidence of the verity of Christianity against all other Sects of Religion and against all Hæreticks, &c. From all which, and many other places in R. H. that rest on Tradition or the Motives for the evidence of a truth, which we believe with a Divine Faith, and by the Operation of the Holy Spirit, as being really Divine and not some false Illusion, it clearly appears, that in this matter the Doctor himself hath first fancied and devised, what he censures and confutes.

The other is—That, whereas R. H. saith, 'That a Divine Faith ultimately resolves it self into a Divine Revelation, which also is heretofore affirmed by Protestants' &c. and that, in such a Resolution, we must come to some Divine Revelation beyond which we cannot proceed to confirm this Revelation with another; plainly thus expressed by R. H. and as being obvious to common sense; Yet Dr. S. makes it almost the bulwark and mainstay of his reasoning, and will to represent R. H. as saying, that nothing less than a Divine Revelation is necessary

|| See below,
§. 124.

the

the proof of every Divine Revelation; and there frequently enquires of R. H. or, in his terms, of the worthy, the wonderful Guide, what Divine Revelation it is, on which the ultimate one (suppose this be it, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; or, that the Church is infallible) is grounded: which, surely he could not but see, plainly contradict R. H. his making some one Divine Revelation the ultimate: And then, here he pleases himself in drawing imaginary Circles out of R. H.'s supposed Answers: Another while he is pleased to represent him as saying, that the ultimate Divine Revelation in such Resolution of our Faith is to be believed with an immediate assent; that is, so|| as that R. H. can give no farther sufficient Reason, Proof, or Evidence, why he believes this last to be a Divine Revelation. ¶ See his Answ. p. 316.

Whereas R. H. as to the first of these, denies constantly any such thing, as that the proof or evidence of a Divine Revelation must necessarily be another Divine Revelation, which would go in infinitum. Again, as to the second, in his putting some Divine Revelation, beyond which we can proceed no further, he saith not absolutely no further as to any, and that a sufficient proof thereof; and this such, as equals and is proportionable to any evidence that a divine Faith pretends to have for the assent which it gives to such Revelation; but every where adds to no further this limitation, as to any other Divine Revelation proving that ultimate one: (See in him §. 145. 132. 133.) And also very frequently alledgeth Tradition, and the other Motives, as an abundantly sufficient proof, that the ultimate Revelation, in our Resolution of Faith, (be it either of those two forenamed) is truly Divine: Nor that any other or fuller Evidence is necessary to a Divine Faith to ground it self upon; which also he hath made his 7th Proposition §. 135. (see also §. 150. 151.) Though for its formal Object, and that certainly which he believes to be therein, and the Divine Motive of its assent, a Divine Faith is affirmed by R. H. but so by all, never to rest or rely on Humane Authority, or any thing short of a Divine Revelation. See §. 126. That humane Testimony or Church-Tradition, taken in the latter sense, in its making known to us, what are these Divine Revelations, or this Word of God, is only introductive to this Divine Faith, which relies on and adheres to, the Revelations themselves as its formal Object. And *ibid.* That Divine Revelation is the formal Object or ultimate Divine Motive into which we resolve our Faith, and the Church's Tradition testifying or manifesting to us these matters revealed is a condition and prerequisite or introductive for the application of our faith unto those Divine Revelations, on which we exercise it. So a Divine Faith, in believing the Scriptures to be God's Word (supposing this to be the ultimate Divine Revelation whereinto it is resolved) rests finally on this self

Self same Proposition, that is delivered to it by Tradition, as the Object whereon it principally relies; and on Gods Veracity as the Divine Motive of its confidence thereof; and not on the evidence of the Tradition which it hath, that this is a Divine Revelation: though yet this Divine Faith hath no other evidence, but such is a Divine Revelation, than that of Tradition. And so, when one Divine Revelation is proved by another, there is no more Evidence in this proof than that of Tradition; because such Tradition is all the Evidence we have that that Revelation, by which the other is proved, is Divine. I have premised this before the following Discourse, not intending there to trouble the Reader any more with such Expofulations; more willing to prosecute a subject, than an Adversary.

Q. 15.
§. 120.

IN the last place, then, it is further pressed: That a Moral certainty, or, if you will, a moral infallibility, if it could perhaps be shewed for many of those things mentioned in the former questions, yet is not sufficient to afford a ground of faith, which Catholics do require as necessary: Because they say, that a Christian cannot with a right, and a divine faith believe the particular points of his faith to be divinely revealed, and so not-possibly fallible, unless he have an infallible, or a not-possibly fallible, assurance thereof: nor can he have such infallible assurance, unless the Church's definitions in her General Councils that deliver such doctrines to be Divine Revelations, be so infallible. Nor can he be infallibly assured that the definitions of any Council in particular are so infallible, unless he be infallibly certain, that such Council is a lawful General Council (for, all other inferiour Councils, Catholics grant, may err in their definitions): nor can he be infallibly certain of this, unless he be so of all those things too, without which, Catholics grant, it is no lawful General Council. And, if any pretend here an infallible certainty also of all those things that are necessary to be known herein from the Testimony of the Church, as this being *Infallible*; it is asked again, whence this Testimony is infallibly known by Him to be so; where, if it be said, from our *Lord's promises* to the Church, declared in the *Scriptures*; and so the infallibility of the Church's Testimony be resolved into Divine Revelation: It is still urged; whence can any know infallibly, either in particular, that those *Texts* which are urged to make good such a promise, have such a *sense* as is pretended; or in general, that the *Scriptures* containing such Texts, are the infallible Word of God? and here again, if we return to prove an infallible certainty of the sense of these particular Scriptures, or in general of the Scriptures being divine, from the *testimony* of the Church, here will be a Circle.

But

But if I proceed, and say; Either concerning the Testimony of the Church its being infallible; Or, concerning the Scriptures their being Gods Word; That these are sufficiently proved from Tradition; and the other motives of credibility; much dilated on by Catholick Writers; which I will here set you down once for all, and so, in other places, refer to them. *As: From the multitude of those, who have affirmed their receiving of these divine Revelations from those, who were known by Miracles to be sent from God; the multitude of them, I say, considered together with their wisdom; their sanctity; their unanimous consent throughout so many ages; their affirming such truth much contrary to all their secular interests; to the appetites of the flesh; and ambitions of this world; their delivering them both by word and writing to their children and posterity; to be delivered again to theirs; as matters of the highest moment; and wherein it eternally concerneth them, not to be deceived; as also their strict charge to deliver nothing in these matters of faith to their children, which they have not received from their Forefathers; their suffering many times cruel deaths for the worth of their testimony; the miracles in several ages done also by them; which miracles, when done for the testifying of their Faith, such in those ages as have seen, have had the like evidence of this Faith, as those, who saw the miracles of the Apostles; and those who have not seen, but believe the credible Relations of them; have the like evidence of their Faith, as those also had in the Apostles times, who believed (as doubtless many did) not seeing, but only hearing of the Apostles miracles.* *¶* If, I say, I proceed thus, to prove the Church infallible or, Scripture Gods Word, from these motives of credibility; Here again it is asked concerning these Motives, whether they also be pretended not possibly fallible; & to carry a certainty in them equal to that infallible assent of divine faith, that is given to the former (which assent of divine faith is pretended to be more firm, than any humane knowledge can be; because it doth ultimately rest upon divine authority; and yet, which divine faith, at last, to avoid a Circle, is by Catholicks for its certainty, made to rest upon that which is not divine Authority, these prudential Motives). It is asked therefore, in the last place, whether these Motives be pretended not possibly fallible, or no? If not; how can a not-possibly-fallible, or a divine, faith be grounded on Motives only highly probable, or only morally certain; or the thing that is proved, or Conclusion, be rendered certain, or not-possibly-fallible to me, from a possibly-fallible proof; or *Medium*? Since the thing proving, or the ground of my assent, must be more credible, evident, and certain to me, than the thing proved by it.

But, if these motives also be affirmed

U u

med

med not possibly fallible; 1st. How can that be? since all men however taken, divided, or conjoynd, single, or a multitude, vulgar, or wise and learned, are (possibly) liable both to deceive, and to be deceived; and 2^{ly}. Thus at least *Divine Faith* will ultimately be built upon, and resolved into, not *Divine*, but *humane*, authority; and again this *humane* authority be equalled in its infallibility to *Divine Revelation*; contrary to the doctrine of Catholics.

And, if it should be said here; that this Tradition and the Motives are indeed not possibly fallible: but this not of themselves, but from the Divine Superintendency, Goodness and Veracity, always guarding those that direct us to his right service and worship from error. It will be replied, that, how infallible forever by this Divine assistance the Motives be, yet so long as we are uncertain of this, their Infallibility, so long is our Faith uncertain; and then, it is asked; Since we first learn the verity of Christian Religion, and of Scriptures, from the persuasion of these Motives, whence we can be infallibly assured of such Divine Assistance to them, before we know as yet either that Religion, which they recommend, to be the true; or the Scriptures, which they recommend, to be Gods word? How can we be infallibly assured, that these Scriptures and Religion are true and infallible, from the Motives, whereas we can be infallibly assured, that the Motives are divinely assisted and so infallible, only from these presupposed: 1st. that this Gods true Religion and word, which the Motives persuade, Here then the Application of Gods Veracity and Superintendency to the Motives, which renders them infallible, presupposeth the Motives first to be so persuasive and convincing for the Truth of Christianity, (before such Divine Veracity applied to them) as any other Religion can shew the like: (Else other Religions may apply as well Gods Veracity to their Motives) 2nd. Therefore we have no more certainty of Gods veracity accompanying the Motives than we have first that these Motives recommend to us Gods true Religion. If then we have only a moral Certainty of the one, so must we of the other.

§. 122.

But, lastly, if it be said here, that the Resolution of *Divine Faith* into these prudential Motives, and this Tradition (whether fallible, or infallible) is only as into an extrinsecal *prerequisite*, or *introduction* to it; not, as into the *formal Cause*, or *ground* of it; for that (he) I ground always the divine and infallible assent I give to any article of my Faith, upon Divine Revelation, and the Prime Verity, because I believe God said it; and that he cannot lie; it will be said still; since some Divine Revelation must thus always

be

be the *final* Motive of a Divine Faith; from what other Divine Revelation I do believe that shall one to be a Divine Revelation; in which proceeding, if it go not *in infinitum* [C] I must come at last to some Divine Revelation, in which I ultimately rest, and concerning which I can produce no other Revelation Divine (and so no ground at all) why, or from which, I can believe it with a Divine Faith to be such; unless I will betake my self to a Circle? So, for example, in proving the Church's Infallibility from Divine Revelation contained in the Scriptures; and again the Scriptures God's Word, from Divine Revelation *unwritten* delivered by the Apostles, I can produce no further Divine Revelation, that testifies such Revelation, or Tradition to be delivered by the Apostles, if I return not back to the first of these, the Church's Infallibility; which returning thither makes a Circle. And the same thing will happen the other way also; in proving Scriptures from Apostolic Tradition; and this Apostolic Tradition again from Church Infallibility: since of this Church Infallibility at last I can bring no Divine Revelation for a proof, if I return not back to Scriptures. But then, if to avoid this Circle, I come still to some Divine Revelation on which my Divine Faith ultimately rests, how to be further confirmed by any other? This will be far from that which was at first pretended, namely, the Catholic's having an infallible assurance of his Faith. For here at last he believes something, of which he can give no further reason, or proof, why he believes it in such a manner, which is to set up an arbitrary faith. And thus, what better account gives a Christian of his Divine Faith, than a Mahomedan, who also pretends his faith grounded on Divine Revelation, without proving it? it would not be long, now, but which

To this purpose Dr. S. Rat. Account, p. 126. When you go about (saith he) to prove the Church's Infallibility by the Motives of Credibility, &c. you Divine Faith, as he, which may be built on these Motives of Credibility which you please [C] If it be, then, by your own confession, a Divine Faith may be built on such Motives; if it be not, there is no use in this purpose? For the Question is not, Whether by any other kind of reason you cannot avoid the circle; but, whether in the Resolution of Divine Faith you can [C] For, I hope, you deny not, that the Scriptures, and the Church's Infallibility are both to be built on the same kind of reason, that upon an infallible testimony on this subject, then how can you build a Divine Faith you believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? You answer, Because the Church, which is infallible, delivers them so to us. [C] If I then ask, why will a Divine Faith you believe the Church's Infallibility? Answer me, if you can, any other way, than because the Scriptures

which are infallible; say so. Will you, or dare you say, That is an Assent of the same nature, which is built on the Motives of Creditability, with that which is grounded on an infallible testimony? If it be not, I think you self of a new Answer. w. n. g. And p. 138. Whatsoever is an Article of Faith must be believed on Divine Authority; but that the Church is infallible, I suppose to you is an Article of Faith. Name therefore what Divine Authority the belief of that is built upon. But, Do not you say, the belief of that is built on the Motives of Creditability; and I suppose, you distinguish them from Divine Authority, or else they can do you no service for avoiding the Circle. Either therefore deny that your Church's Infallibility is an Article of Faith, [&] or else deny it to be necessary, that every Article of Faith must be built on Divine Authority. Thus He and out of about ten years I

§. 123.

To which involved Question that I may return a more clear Answer, I will 1st. give you some generall Positions, or Concessions in this matter, which all Parties seem to agree in; and then that, which Roman-Catholics further maintain; and In the last place examine, whether, according to what is objected, the Roman Catholic's Faith incurs a Circular Resolution. 1st. Then, It is agreed by all; That the Faith, by which we are saved, must be in it self most true, and infallible, or not-possible to be false. Or; That there must be a certitudo objecti, and those be truly Divine Revelations, which our Faith apprehends to be so: See for this many Testimonies of Protestants below, §. 127. n. 2.

But note here, of which more hereafter (for avoiding mistakes), that the object of this Divine Faith may be most infallibly true, when yet, he that believes it, may not be infallibly certain that it is so. And He may dy, and become a Martyr in defence of the most infallible certainty of the object of his Faith, as being Gods own Word, when only he believes it so, but cannot prove it so; not, even by those evidences, which some others have for it. And in this case he lies in the profession of his Faith; viz. that he believes in Gods Word; but not so, in his evidence, that he infallibly knows, or can demonstrate it, to be so. Neither doth it hold from the object of belief to the subject, or believe; that, if the one be infallible, the other is so. For a man may hold a most certain truth without knowing those grounds of it also, which (do to others, and) may evidence it to him for most certain. So that the proving also a non-possibly-fallible ground of that which is believed infers not that every one that believes such truth doth, or must, know that ground also; or, knowing the ground, know it to be infallible.

124. 2. Agreed also: That such Divine and saving Faith doth
 always ground itself as to its object on Gods Word; or on the Divine
 Revelation of those things, which are believed by it, and upon the au-
 thority, veracity, and goodness of God revealing faith things (from
 which its reliance on Divine Authority it is also called Faith Di-
 vine) Which is the language and assertion of learned Protestants,
 as well as Catholicks; See Bish. White Answer to Fisher, p. 24.—
 We resolve our faith into the authority of Gods Word—as into the Di-
 vine Motive, and Object of Belief. And before p. 14.—The
 last and final resolution of Divine Faith [i.e. as into the Divine Mo-
 tive and object] cannot be made into the voice of Tradition unwritten
 —being not formally Divine. And Archbishop Land, p. 64. &c.
 contends —that nothing but the Word of God is the object of a divine
 belief; and quotes Bellarmine — *Fides verbo Dei nititur*; and || De verbo
 elsewhere † S. Austin * — *Fidei ultima resolutio est in Deum illu-* Dei. l. 4. c. 4.
minantem, &c. Christians then, however coming to the knowledge † p. 115.
 of these Divine Revelations, whether from an infallible Guide; * Contra
 the Church in her Councils, or from a fallible, their Pastors, their Funda. c. 14.
 Parents, or some Book, yet do resolve this Divine Faith no other-
 wise, as to the ultimate ground, for all cause or reason of their
 believing, i.e. with so strong and resolute an adherence to it, than
 the Apostles themselves did (who received these Revelations im-
 mediately from Christ and God himself) namely into the veracity
 of God, known or believed by them to have delivered such parti-
 cular Articles of their Faith. The Believers Syllogism or Reason-
 ing running thus: What God, the Prime Verity faith, or re-
 vealeth is true; God hath said or revealed such or such a particu-
 lar, therefore it is true. Where note, that Gods Veracity here a-
 lone which is the first Premise, and a self-evident Principle to na-
 turall Reason, is not a sufficient ground of such faith of any parti-
 cular Revelation, (since on this Veracity of God in generall many
 false Religions also, as to one Premise, are grounded: i.e. many
 false Religions believe, that whatever God saith is true; and fur-
 ther believe, but falsely, that God hath said, what they are taught);
 unless another Proposition be joined with it, and that true, viz.
 That God, who is, thus, True, and cannot ly in whatever he
 saith, hath also said this particular thing which we believe. [Of
 which thus Cardinal Lugo †; *De Fidei Fidei Divina. Diss. 1. §. 7.*
Duplex est ratio formalis partialis, qui ultimo Fides [Divi-
na] nititur. Deus est Prima Veritas. Et Deus in divinis
 Where note also; That all such Revelations are necessarily
 some part of Gods Word, either written in the Scriptures; or un-
 written, and descending to us by Tradition Apostolical, and
 that

that one Divine Revelation is many times deduced from, or proved by some other; where is discovered a necessary consequence; but is not therefore necessarily always so.

§. 125. n. I.

Now, from a Divine Faith its thus grounding it self still upon Divine Revelation; it follows, that every one that believes with a Divine Faith both is obliged to believe, and indeed must necessarily believe, the Matter of his Faith to be Infallible; because he believes it to be Gods Word; and he knows Gods Word is so, and must also believe it to be infallible or certain in the very highest degree (and consequently to be embraced above all contrary objects; and not to be altered upon any occasion, supposition, or authority, of Men, or Angels) because the certainty, or infallibility, or unliableness to deceive of this *Prime Verity*, infinitely exceeds all created certainties, moral, or natural; all which are liable to a possibility of deception; even that of our Senses. Whatever infallibility therefore any other immediate Proposition of the Matter of my Faith, or of Divine Revelation hath, yet Divine Faith ascends higher than it, and fasteneth it self still to the infallibility of him, whose primarily is the Revelation. Nor is the matter revealed only its Object but also Gods revealing such matter the ultimate ground or Reason of such an adherence to it (I say not Evidence of it) as far transcends that credence we have of any humane Testimony.

For example. The Church or my Pastor or Parents, which I give credit to, declaring to me that the things contained in the Gospel of S. Matthew were divinely revealed, here I resolve my Divine faith of the truth of those contents not into the Church's or my Parents saying they are true, though I believe, all that true they tell me, but into the Divine Revelation; because God by his Evangelist delivers them for Truth. Again; when I believe, that all contained in S. Mattheus Gospel is true, merely because the Church tells me it is so; and then believe, that the Church tells me true, because God hath revealed, (be it in some other part of the Scriptures, or otherwise,) that the Church intelling me this shall not err; here my Faith is ultimately resolved again not into the Church's Relation as a Body prudently creditable, but the Divine Revelation concerning the Church's infallibility. But, 3ly. If I believe S. Mattheus Gospel true, as I do some other secular story, because the Church tells me so; and again believe this Church's veracity only as an *insigne multitudo hominum* prudently rendered still more credible to me by the other Prudential Motives, forementioned (§. 124.) here I resolve my Faith into this Tradition and the *credibile* Motives; and this is no *infused*, or *divine*, but

but an *human*, and *acquisite* faith; and my assent herein may be no firmer, or stronger in respect of my adherence to the thing believed than it is, to these credible Relators thereof. Thus then, when the authority of the Relater is the same, yet the things related may be diversely believed by me, according to the varying of those grounds, or that Authority, which the Relater urgeth to me to make them credible. So, when a very credible person relates to me several things, which he hath heard of two other Persons, of whom I have a very different esteem; the one accounted by me very skillful, and learned in his Art; the other not so; here I give an assent or belief to the words of these two Persons, though both related to me with the same fidelity, very different; much stronger to the related words of him, whom I esteem as it were infallible in his skill; much weaker to the other's; and I give a third assent different from both these to the veracity of the Relater, or to the credibility of the Person relating these things to me concerning them. And this is observed by Bishop *White* in his answer to *F. Fisher* p. 25. *When a Preacher, saith he, delivers Apostolical doctrine, we believe both the Preacher, and the doctrine. Yet we resolve not our faith finally and principally into the authority of the Preacher, but into the Divine Verity is self preached by him. Every thing by which we are moved to believe, and without whose authority we should not have believed, is not the principal object wherinto divine faith is finally resolved, as appeareth by miracles, preaching, instruction of parents, &c. And p. 13. — That is not always the last ground of resolution, upon whose voice and testimony we do first of all, or prioritately ordain, vel temporis, in priority of time or order, believe things; because there may be other grounds of belief equal, or of greater authority, than the first voice. And Archbishop *Lawd*, || — Every thing that is the first inducer to believe is not by and by either the principal Motive, or the chief and last Object of belief, upon which a man may rest his faith. ¶ Thus a Divine Faith, whoever the immediate Relater be, being once informed that God hath said so, ascends above the relater, and ultimately rests upon the Divine Revelation.*

2. And next; since these particular Revelations, making up the second Premise on which this Faith rests, and wherein many times the assent to one depends on another, and that on a third, cannot proceed or confirm one another in infinitum; It follows here again; that such Divine Faith must resolve it self into some particular ultimate Divine Revelation (which may be not to all the same, but to some one, to some another) beyond which one can resolve his Divine Faith no further as to its formal object; and for the proving or confirming of which Revelation, he can produce

no,

|| §. 16. p. 82.

§. 125. n. 2.

|| Paul Layman Theol. no other Divine Revelation; but as to these there must end; unless a process be made in *infinitum*, or else a Circle. || *Fides Divina Moral.* 2. *discurſiva eſt non poteſt circa omnia objecta ſua, quia alioquin ſequitur, reſur, proceſſus in infinitum.*

§. 125. n. 3.

For example, If I reſolve a Divine Faith of the Conſubſtantiality of God the Son with the Father into the Infallibility of the Church determining it, which Church I believe divinely aſſiſted: and again reſolve my Divine Faith of the Church's Infallibility as being divinely aſſiſted, into the Scriptures, Gods own Word declaring it: and again; the belief of the Scripture's being Gods Word, and ſuch the true ſenſe of this Word into Tradition Apoſtolicall, or a matter delivered by the Apoſtles, men divinely inſpired: and yet further my Divine Faith of theſe Apoſtles their being divinely inſpired into the Miracles related to be done by them; a divine work teſtifying Gods Spirit in the Workers. At laſt, in ſome Divine revealing word, or work, I muſt end, without being able to bring any other Divine Revelation, as a Medium, or Induction of my aſſent to the laſt. But I ſay not therefore muſt end, as to the bringing any other rational proof or evidence at all of this laſt Divine Revelation.

§. 126.

3.

349. Since the Church may be conſidered, either * as a Society already maniſteſt by Divine Teſtimony, and Revelation (whether this written, the Scriptures, or unwritten, Apoſtolicall Tradition) to be by the Holy Ghoſt for ever aſſiſted, and guided in all neceſſary truths; Or, before any ſuch Divine Teſtimony known to us, * as a multitude of men famous in wiſdom, innocency of life, ſufferings, &c. things prudentially moving us to credit all their Traditions; 1ſt. Both Churches here agree: That ſuch an humane Teſtimony, or Church-Tradition [taken in the latter ſenſe] in its making known to us what are theſe Divine Revelations or this Word of God, is only introductive to this Divine Faith, which relies on, and adheres to, the Revelations themſelves, as its Formal Object.

† p. 16.

[Scripture is the ground of our Faith; Tradition, the key that lets us in (ſaith Archbiſhop Lawd †.) Divine Revelation (written, or unwritten) and Gods veracity is the Formal Object, or ultimate divine Motive, into which we reſolve our Faith; and the Church's Tradition, teſtifying or maniſteſting to us theſe matters revealed, is a condition, and prerequisite, or introductive, for the application of our Faith unto thoſe Divine Revelations, on which we exerciſe it, ordinarily ſay Catholicks.]

249. Catholicks further affirm concerning this Church; That,

That, as it is considered in the former of the two acceptations, forementioned; the infallible authority and testimony thereof is not only ad-
 roductive into other Articles, but it self also one of the Articles, of
 this Divine Faith, as being Divine Revelation; and that so many, as
 believe the Church's Infallibility in this sense, may safely resolve their
 Divine Faith of the other Articles of their belief into it, delivering
 them, as such. But then they hold; That the Church's Infal-
 libility, thus believed, is not necessarily the ultimate Principle or
 Divine Revelation into which this Divine Faith of other Articles is
 resolved, but that that ultimate Divine Revelation may be either
 that written or unwritten Word of God by which this Church In-
 fallibility is manifested to them; according as the one, or the other
 is in order and in time manifested to any by Tradition, or

4. Again; It is agreed by all; That this Divine Faith
 is wrought no otherwise in the Soul, than by the operation of Gods Spi-
 rit; which Spirit many times begets so firm a credence, and adhe-
 rence to the things believed (not only to this truth, that what is
 Divine Revelation cannot deceive, also imprinted in our Nature,
 but that such particular points are Divine Revelations) as exceeds
 that adherence we have to any humane Science whatsoever
 (wherein there is often a possibility of deceit, though not as to the
 thing, yet as to us; i.e. that we may think we know, what, and
 when we do not.) So that the Believer is more willing to lay down
 his life in defence of the truth of this his Faith, than of the truth of
 any Conclusion in any humane Science whatever, of which he hath
 the greatest evidence, or demonstration.

For the things said hitherto, see Archbishop. Dama-
 scius [faith, meaning the habit or act of a saving Faith] is the
 gift of God alone, and an infused habit, in respect whereof the Soul is
 merely recipient. And this is the habit of Infused Faith, which must
 not be excluded from that work, which none can do but the Believer
 virtue of Faith, of whatever Article, though it receives a kind of pre-
 paration, or occasion of beginning from the testimony of the Church, as
 it propoeth, and induceth to the Faith, yet is that in Gods revelation
 within, and teaching within this, which the Church propoeth without.
 And p. 79. — *Quia* (do what he can, his faith is revealed) And seek
 for a reason, why he will believe, though after he once believes, the
 Faith grows stronger than either his reason, or his knowledge; and great
 reason for this, because it goes higher, and so upon a safer Principle,
 than either of the other [reason or knowledge] can in this life; quoting
 in the Margin S. Thomas — *Quia* Scientia deititudinem habet ex
 natura lumine rationis humanae, quae potest errare; Theologia autem

4.
 §. 127. n. 1.
 See S. Tho.
 22 a. q. 6. de
 causa fidei.

§. 127. n. 2.
 p. 72.

p. 1. q. 1. a. 5

† In 3. Sent.

23. d. 9. 2.

a. 1.

(qua docet et obiectum et notitiam Fidei. sicut et fidem ipsam.) certitudinem habet ex lumine Divina Scientia: quae describi non potest; And
 Ruel. 1. 1. sicut autem ista intelligendum est, ut Scientia certior sit cer-
 tudine evidenter; Fides vero certior firmitate subasione. Major lu-
 men in Scientia; majus robur in Fide. Et hoc, quia in Fide. & ad
 Fidem. sicut imperium Voluntas concurrens. Credere enim est abbas
 Intellectus. Verum assensu, productum ex Voluntatis imperio. And a-
 gain p. 86. Faith (saith the Archbishop, quoting Heb. 11. 1.) is an e-
 vidence, as well as knowledge; and the belief is firmer than any know-
 ledge can be, because it rests upon Divine Authority, which cannot
 deceive. [There is infallible assent in respect of the Object]: whereas
 knowledge (or at least he that thinks he knows) is not sure certain in
 deductions from Principles. And again, he saith, that Falsum may sub-
 esse fidei Catholicae, may be the subject of the Catholick faith, is no lesse
 than blasphemy to affirm. And p. 360. he granteth, — that an infal-
 lible certainty is necessary for that one faith which is necessary to salva-
 tion; and that of this a most infallible certainty we have in the Scrip-
 tures, the Creed, &c. which certainty p. 360. he deduceth thus:
 I believe the entire Scripture, for by the Tradition of the Church;
 and by all other credible doctores; as is before expressed; and last of
 all, by the light which shines in the Scripture in self, kindled in Belie-
 vers by the Spirit of God. Then I believe the entire Scripture infallibly,
 and by a Divine infallibility as sure of my Object. [Where you see
 this Divine infallibility, he speaks of it as had from the Spirit.]
 So p. 315. he saith — That the firmness of Assent by the operation
 of Gods Spirit she will confer a much or more strength, than the Un-
 derstanding doth clearness; the whole Assent being an Act of Faith;
 not of Knowledge. Thus He. And thus D. Pater p. 300. — The as-
 sent of Faith is more certain (if it be possible) than that of the Senses
 or Science, or Demonstration, because it rests in Divine Authority,
 which cannot possibly deceive. [There the certainty of the assent is in
 respect of the Object]; yet it is less an assent invidens, and obscure.
 &c. And again p. 343. The chief Principle or ground on which Faith
 rests, and for which is firmly assented unto, is that which the Church
 propounds, is Divine Revelation made in the Scriptures. Nothing less
 than this, nothing but this, can meet equallity with all Supernatural
 Faith, which must be absolute and without any mixture. — i. e. certain-
 tunc obiecti. And p. 310. The essence of Divine Faith is absolutely
 divine, which requires an object, and therefore is infallibly true; as that
 is neither false, nor can possibly admit of any mixture of error or fal-
 hood, and infallible in this sense, as in the Testimony which is abso-
 lutely Divine. Concerning which we find also such Propositions as
 those in Mr. Chillingworth, c. 6. §. 8. — Certainly I know that I believe

believe the Gospel of Christ (as it is delivered in the most sacred Books of Canonical Scriptures) as surely as that it is nowaday, that I see the light, than I am now writing. And Ib. §. 3. I do heartily acknowledge and believe, that the Articles of our Faith be in their selves Truths as certain and infallible, as the very common principles in Geometry, and Metaphysics. See also, c. 1. §. 3. p. 37. And thus, For Answer to Challenge, p. 41. This point of the infallibility of Faith is opposed by all Protestants; and particularly, they inform us, that we have the Holy Scriptures to be the Word of God; the Spirit and witness of the Holy Ghost do hold Faith to be infallible; and thus those Protestants do maintain also an infallible assent of a Divine Faith, (meaning a certainty or firmness of adhesion in or to the beliefs of the matters of the Christian Faith as Gods own Word, and so most infallible), as strong or stronger (though with a less evidence) than that which we have to matters of science, which firmness is wrought also in us by the operation of the Holy Spirit: But, if they mean by such infallible assent in a Divine Faith, neither this *certitude adhaesiva*, transcending the most infallible assent, we yield to the most demonstrable Truths, nor an assent materially infallible, i. e. in respect of its object, being always a thing absolutely most infallible, delivered before in the first Proposition: Nor lastly, that infallible assent which the evidence of Tradition secures; here these men are obliged to solve the reason of this expression (used also by themselves) for which they so often question Catholics, and shew, what other infallible ground they have of such an infallible assent in a Divine Faith. Meanwhile, if any should deny the Holy Spirit to work in us such a Divine or infused Faith, this Spirit both illuminating and persuading, besides and beyond the evidence, which any other Introductive or Motive affords; let them declare, how a Christians Faith is necessarily a Grace of the Holy Spirit, where there is no effect in this Faith, that is ascribed to the Spirit; but all that they ascribe to it is necessarily consequent to another, humane, and rational, and only external evidence, that is also affirmed self-manifest, and not possibly fallible in the production of a belief of any other common humane Traditions, that descend from the Ancestors to Posterity, as well as of those Divine Truths.

But here note, that it is also generally agreed, that this internal operation of a Divine Faith by the Holy Spirit, here spoken of, cannot be urged as any evidence or proof either to others, or to ones self, (unlesse where one hath extraordinary revelation) of the truth of his Faith, or of his Religion: Or (which is all one) Faith cannot be resolved into the Holy Spirit, as any evi-

dence or proof thereof, so as to argue thus [I know I have a true Faith because I have the Spirit, or because I have the efficiency, or the testimony of the Holy Spirit for it] (the old exploded Puritan way of Resolution of Faith): for, though it is true, that the Spirit is always the efficient of a Divine Faith; and in this sense one may resolve Divine Faith into the Spirit, i. e. as its internal efficient; that is, may affirm, that whosoever the person be that hath a Divine Faith, the Holy Spirit is the efficient of it in him: Yet doth not this Spirit also usually effect an assurance to our selves, and much lesse such an one as we can prove and manifest to others, that we have a true and Divine Faith. As for this purpose, the pretence of the testimony of the Spirit must be utterly

† p. 74. §. 8.
|| p. 203.

laid aside, as the Arch-Bishop †, and also Dr. Stillingfleet ||, and before them Mr. Chillingworth have observed. And thus F. Bacon speaking of the Act of a Divine Faith produced by Gods Spirit, *Analys. Fid. Diss. 3. p. 177.* *Actus nec refertur supra se, nec cognoscitur noticia nulla plane infallibili, cui falsum subesse nequit, ne quidem obfcura, multo minus evidenti; se, esse in substantia superna naturalem, aut qualem oportet esse ad salutem; non enim veri sumus, quod esse & supernaturaliter credimus, ut cum Durando docet Suarez, Valentia, Turrianus; Goniack & Tannerus. Et quatenus expectatur quilibet se firmiter credere, ob Dei auctoritatem, non tamen propterea est ipse actus, re ipsa infallibilis: quia posset ea firmitas provenire ex propria dispositione, sicut in hereticis, ut optime Valentia: est ergo infallibilis, quia pendet a causis infallibilibus supradictis, siue ea percipiuntur a nobis, siue non. Ex quibus inferitur, quod hic precipue habendum est pra oculis, nullam rationem requiri ad fidei nostra certitudinem, quod nos scientifice & evidenter noverimus esse actum certum & infallibilem: hoc enim scientia est, non fidei, in quo aliqui decepti non leviter videntur.* The Holy Spirit then breeds in us such a firm adhesion to the Catholick Faith we profess, as that we will not on any hazard whatever desert this Faith. But this Spirit doth not ascertain us further, that it is it self the good and no false Spirit; that causes in us such a firm adherence to a Revelation that is truly Divine; except only that we know hypothetically, that, if our faith be truly Divine, and Catholick, it is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. But, for this assurance to my self, for proof also to others, that my faith as to its object is or may be effected by this good, and not a seducing Spirit, I retire to another rational evidence that is manifestive to others; of which by and by.

§. 129. p. 1.

5.

It is also truly affirmed, upon this supposition that the Supreme Governours of the Church are infallibly assisted by this,

this Holy Spirit in all Necessaries, that Tradition qualified with the Motives must be in the like manner *infallible*; since these Church-Governours divinely-assisted are always some part at least of these Traditionists. For, though they are not known as yet to him, in whom they are first planting the Christian-Faith, to be any thing more than *illustre multitudo*, or *congregatio hominum prudentium*, &c. and are taken in the latter acception mentioned before, §. 126. Yet are they not then when they plant these principles any whit less divinely-assisted (for they are so always) than when after ward they are known, by the person more improved, to be so from the expresse testimony of Gods Word, and when their Infallibility is now become one of the Articles of his Faith. I say, they are as infallible when comprehended under the name of *Illustre Congregatio*, &c. and of those Traditionists; or that humane Tradition, which the Motives make most credible, as when styled the Church of God, the Pillar, and Ground of Truth. Upon another supposition also first known and granted, namely, that the foresaid Tradition promotes Gods true and no false Religion, the same thing seems also to follow, *vid.* that the vigilant Providence and Veracity of God will not permit the testimony of such a multitude to erre or falsifie; and misinform men in any necessary truth thereof; but that what they deliver as revealed by him is most truly so; and that from such Divine Providence such Tradition shall be for ever preserved most certain and infallible. Of which thus F. Bacon *Analyt. Fidei. Disp. 3. p. 176.* — *Motiva credibilitatis sunt principia credenda prorsus infallibilia, non quidem ex natura rei, & vi sua praevisa; sed prout substantiam Dei providentiae, qui de re ipsa ut nunquam his notis infirmatur nisi vera Dei revelatio; ut supra est dictum. Igitur ille qui his motivis manuducitur; infallibiliter eo ipso assequitur verum: & implicat contradictionem ut per ea arctetur ad falsum.*

But then here also it is much to be noted, that though in either of these respects; the Divine Providence, or also Promise, those first Deliverers of the Christian Faith to us may be styled supernaturally infallible, yet cannot such divine assistance be urged as an evidence or proof to others, or ones self, of such their Infallibility, when these Proponents or Motives, beget in one the first assent to the Christian Faith; Or, I cannot resolve my Faith ultimately into these Proponents or Motives, as being thus supernaturally-assisted, and so infallible. The reason is, because, though indeed they are so supernaturally assisted, yet is such thing can be evident to me, nor can I either satisfy my self, or prove to others that they are so, till first I have admitted and given credit to that Religion they propose to me as the true Reli-

§. 129. n. 2.

gion:

gion; because from this *Christian Faith and Religion*, supposed true, it is, that I collect that these proposers are supernaturally assisted in the proposal of all the necessary truths therein (for, not all, but the proposers only of Gods true Religion are so assisted) and therefore I cannot again, from their being supernaturally assisted in the Proposal, collect or prove, that this Religion is true, without incurring a Circle. We must know the *Divine assistance* to be annexed to the Motives of *Catholick Religion*, before that we know these Motives to be thus *infallible*: And (again) we must know the *Catholick* (and not another) to be Gods *true Religion*, before we can know that Gods supernatural assistance is annexed to the Motives thereof; and therefore we must know or believe the *Catholick Religion* to be true, before we know the Motives thereof to be rendered thus infallible. And so, here we gather not the Infallibility of the *Catholick Religion* from the Infallibility of its Motives, but the Infallibility of its Motives from the Truth of this Religion. Now so it is, that for knowing the truth of this Religion or Faith, our uttermost repair is to the Motives; therefore this repair must be to these abstracting from this their Infallibility, or when they are not yet known by us to be infallible; viz. this way infallible from any Divine Providence, concurrence, or assistance.

§. 129. n. 3.

6.

Ecclef. 19. 4

Gly, it is agreed on, and also copiously proved by many Learned Catholics, that this Divine Faith of, and firm adherence to, such Revelations as Divine, wrought in Christians by the internal operation of Gods Holy Spirit, spoken of in the third Proposition, doth not also necessarily require, or is not also necessarily joyned with, or preceded by, any either non-possibly or non-morally fallible Proponents of such divine truths. It being only necessary to a divine and salvific faith, that it have that which is in it self truly a Divine Revelation for the object thereof; and that it be a grace and effect in him of the Holy Spirit (the work of which Spirit that Faith can never be that believes any thing false): and that, according to the best prudence he can use, such object of his faith (that is, a Divine Revelation) be rendered the most credible to him. [for, *qui est credis levis est corde*; and such credible arguments for the truth of the *Catholick Faith* are very obvious to the meanest capacities; that are a little inquisitive, as easily overweigh those that recommend to him the belief of any other Sect or Religion.] I say, that though we suppose there is such a Proponent, or rational Motive not-morally or, if you will, not-possibly, fallible, which such his Divine Faith is, capable of being grounded upon, or, confirmed by; yet that it

is

is not necessary that every one, for attaining this Divine or saving Faith, should either have such a Proponent, or, having it, should be infallibly certain, that such Proponent, or Motive, is infallible.

And such is the Divine and salvific Faith of many Illiterate Laity, and of younger persons, making no small part of the Catholick Church, who learn their Faith only from the Relation of their Pastor, or their Parents; on the testimony of some very few persons without having any experience, how far the rest of the world consents with these in the same Relations: And, who, busied in low employments, and acquainted with few, save those of their own family, cannot attain the assurance that is contained in the Motives, or in the knowledge of a general tradition; but rely, for that knowledge they have in matters of Faith, only on the testimony of those who possibly may either through ignorance be deceived; or also, through some malice, deceive in the things they report. And whatsoever these may hear from them of an universal tradition of those things which they tell them, yet have they no more certainty of what they say in this, than they have, in the rest; nor can any certainty be found herein, equalling that, which the Motives yield us. And yet these simple young unexperienced persons may, through the efficacy of Gods Spirit, have a firmer adherence, and love to this Faith, I mean as to suffer, or dy, for it, than many others, which have the greatest rational certainty thereof. Now, this thing once granted, whatever controversy may be raised, concerning the existence of such an external not possibly, or not morally fallible Proponent or Motive, yet concerning the absolute necessity thereof, as to all true Believers, or as to the begetting of a true Divine and saving Faith, there can be none.

This Proposition, though it seems evident enough of itself, yet, lest it should meet with any dispute, I think fit not to send abroad unguarded with the testimony of several Catholick Divines; yet whose authority I desire may not be so much respected, as their reasons and arguments considered, which to me seem unspeakable. And you will excuse me if I give you their testimonies more full, than their sense may not be mistaken. (Meanwhile the Reader that hath no scruple in this matter, may, omitting these, all, or in part, pass on to the next Proposition, §. 135.

Of this matter then thus discoursed Cardinal Hugo a Spanish Jesuit, speaking of divine faith, *Probatur facile; quia hoc ipsum Ecclesiam habere auctoritatem infallibilem ex assensu Spiritus sancti per creditur fidei doctrina, quae docet in Ecclesia esse huiusmodi dispensationem.* §. 129. n. 4. *Tom. de virtute fidei.* p. 247.

huius

huius infallibilis auctoritatis. Ex experientia docet non omnes pueros, vel adultos, qui de novo ad fidem accedunt, concipere [much less, infallibiliter scire] in Ecclesia hanc infallibilem auctoritatem, & assistentiam Spiritus sancti, antequam ullum alium articulum credent. Credunt enim Articulos in ordine, quo proponuntur. Ignotum autem Articulum auctoritatis Ecclesiastica contingit tradidisse postquam alios plures crediderunt. Solum ergo potest ad summum praerogari, cognoscere res fidei proponi ab Ecclesia, concipiende in Ecclesia secundum se auctoritatem maximam humanam, quae reperitur in universa fidelium congregatione.... n. 252. --- In lege natura plures credebant, ex sola doctrina parentum, sine alia Ecclesiae propositione. Deinde in lege scriptae plures crediderunt Moysi, & aliis Prophetis, antequam eorum Prophetia ab Ecclesia reciperetur [I add; or before they saw their miracles, or the fulfilling of their Prophecies].

§. 129. n. 5.

† In 3. sent.

23. d. 13. §.

Thus Estius † speaking also of this divine, and salvific faith
--- Fidei impertinens est, quo medio Deus utatur ad conferendum homini donum fidei [i. e. divina] quantum enim nunc ordinatur modum sic Ecclesiae restructio, & doctrina, constar tamen aliis viis, seu mediis fidei collatam fuisse aliquando, & adhuc conferri, &c. Nam antiqui multi, ut Abraham, Melchizedech, Job, & specialiter revelatione; Apostoli ex Christi miraculis, & sermone. [yet these having no other formal, or ultimate motive of their faith, than we have] rursus ex Apostolorum predicatione, & miraculis [I add and some without, and before, seeing their miracles, and others by incredible relation only, not sight, of their miracles; yet all these means faith of the same nature and efficiency] Alii fidem conciperunt aliis denique aliis modis crediderant; cum nondum de infallibilitate doctrina Ecclesiastica, quaequam eis esset annunciata. Sic ergo furis potest, ut aliquis non adherens doctrina Ecclesiastica, tanquam regula infallibili, quadam ad fidem perveniret proprio Dei verbo recipiat, quia, vel in lege, vel olim, in miraculis confirmata sunt; vel etiam, quia viderat Ecclesiam sic docuisse manifeste. Viderat, vel etiam, quacumque ratione inductus, licet alia quadam credere recuset.

§. 130.

† Theol. mo-

ral. l. 2. tract

1. c. 5.

Thus Paul Layman a Jesuit † --- Fieri saepe solet, ut alii Articuli fidei, quos aputa quae sunt de Persona, & viribus explicare credantur ante hunc, qui est de infallibili Ecclesiae auctoritate. Quintima haec Ecclesiae infallibilitas Spiritus sancti promissione nititur, ergo prius oportet credere Spiritum Sanctum, adeoque Trinitatem in divinis esse. Prater ea constitas primos Christianos fide divina credidisse: non ob auctoritatem Ecclesiae, quae vix fundata non erat (v. g. cum Sanctus Petrus credidit Christum esse Filium Dei vivum, Act. 16.) vel nondum fidei dogmata definita. Agam: Hic addo non tantum variis modis homines ad fidem amplectendam moveri, sed etiam alios, alios facilius parum propter

m. a. jorem

maiores internam Spiritus sancti illustrationem, & impulsione[m] (sicuti notavit Valentia q. 1. part. 4. arg. 8.) partim pro animi sui simplicitate, quia de opposito errore persuasionem nullam conceperunt; quâ ratione pueri apud Catholicos, cum ad usum rationis pervenerunt, acceptant fidei mysteria tamquam divinitus revelata, quia nati majores, & prudentes, quos ipsi norunt, ita credere animadvertunt. Again—Formale assentiendi principium, seu motivum non est Ecclesia autoritas. Si enim ex te quæram, cur credas Deum esse incarnatum? Respondeasque; Quia Ecclesia Catholica, quæ errare non potest, ob sancti spiritus assensentiam, ita testatur, iterum ex te quæram, unde id scias? vel cur credas Ecclesiam errare non posse, vel sanctum spiritum ei assistere? Quare recte dixit Canus. Si generaliter quæatur, unde fidei constet, ea † Loc. Theol. 1.2.c.8. qua fide tenas, esse a Deo revelata, non poterit infallibilem Ecclesia autoritatem adducere; quia unum ex revelatis est, quod Ecclesia errare non possit. Interim non negamus (saith he) quin resolutio fidei in auctoritatem Ecclesie, quatenus spiritu sancto regitur, fieri possit, & communiter soleat, a fidelibus ipsis, qui infallibilem spiritum sancti assensentiam ac directionem Ecclesia promissam certâ fide tenent; his enim ejus testimonium, ac definitio, certa regula est ad alios articulos amplectendos. Thus he of the Church, as it is a Society, manifested by Divine Revelation to be infallibly assisted in all necessities by the Holy Ghost. But then, as the Church appears to us, before such revelation, known by us only as an illustrious congregatio tot hominum excellentium, &c. he speaks of it on this manner—Fidei divina assensus in [hanc] auctoritatem Ecclesie non resolvitur, tanquam in principium, sed tanquam in extrinsecum adjumentum, & conditionem, sine qua non. Etenim autoritas illa Ecclesie, non quatenus consideratur ut organum Spiritus sancti, sed ut illustris congregatio hominum prudentium, &c. est quidem formale principium credendi fide humanâ; sed non fide divina. Quia fides divina est, qua Deo dicenti credimus ob auctoritatem & veritatem ejus; consequenter qui credit solum propter auctoritatem hominum, vel simile motivum humanum, is fide solum humanâ credit. Accedit, quod (sicuti ipsimet Scotus, & Gabriel argumentantur) assensus cognoscitivus non possit excedere certitudinem principii quo nititur; assensus autem fidei divina certitudinem infallibilem habet [objectivè]; quo fieri non potest, ut assensus fidei divine, tanquam principio nitatur auctoritati hominum, vel simili motivo humano, quippe quod secundum se absolute fallibile est.

F. Bacon in his *Analysis Fidei* Disp 3.c.8. discoursing copiously on this subject supposeth: 1st. This—*Illiteratos in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ non credere fide verâ & divinâ, nullâ ratione dici posse.* 2^{ly}—*Illos de Ecclesiâ Antiquitate, Miraculis &c., audivisse solum per Majorum suorum instructionem, qui certe cum aequali apud illos*

authoritate, & veritatis specie, eque magnâ potuissent dicere de sectâ falsâ. 3ly.—Istos, consideratâ rei magnitudine, ac necessitate, argumentorum probabilitate, &c. ex motione Divina Gratia judicare, hic & nunc expedire, ut doctrinam propositam tanquam verè divinam amplectantur. 4ly. Upon which—*Præsto esse Deum cum auxilio supernaturali ut faciat fidem illam Theologicam, & sicut oportet ad salutem. Quotiescunque enim (saith he) homo prudenter judicat sibi hic & nunc credendum esse fide Divinâ, qualiacumq; sunt Motiva, si res ipsa, quam credit, revelata sit, nihil deest ex prærequisitis, ut infundatur ei fides Divina & supernaturalis. Ex quo sequitur, ratiõibus istis necessariam non esse propositionem fidei tam exactam, ut ei falsum subesse moraliter non possit. Sufficit enim majorum autoritas Pastorum, viz. & parentum, qui hac vel illa iis proponunt nomine Ecclesiæ, ut a Deo revelata. And see there, the many other Authors quoted by him for the same opinion, and among these Vasquez. 1.2. disp. 120. n. 15.—Suarez de Fide Disp. 4. §. 5. n. 7. 8. 9. where Suarez proposeth these two Answers concerning illiterate and simple persons; either, *Evidentiam Credibilitatis esse necessariam ad Fidem, intelligendum esse respectu corporis ecclesiæ, non vero respectu singularum personarum.* Or—*Ubi contingit exterior propositio non sufficiens, illam per divinam inspirationem, & vocationem internam [i.e. by the internal operation of their faith by Gods spirit] compleri.* See also Ibid. c. 7. p. 173. 174. confirmed out of the same Authors; That all the certitude that is required as necessary in the subject or person, who believes that the object or matter of his faith is most certain and infallible, is only a certainty of adhesion to it as such, not a certainty of Infallibility that is known to him to be so. Which material Infallibility in the act of faith the believer is said to have without an evidence of it. See Ib. sect. 129.—*Certitudo ex parte cause, que sine evidentiâ dari queat—& §. 133.—Potest actus esse infallibilis hoc certitudinis genere inevidenti, etiam si nos clarè & experimentaliter hanc certitudinem non percipiamus.* See the same again, §. 135. And, §. 138. To the objection—*Ut actus fidei sit certus requiruntur, ut ipse verè cognoscat suum cognoscendi modum esse infallibilem: aliàs erit solum materialiter certus, non formaliter,* he answers, *Solum requiri ut firmissimè, i.e. sine ullâ dubitatione voluntariâ mihi persuadentem objectum non posse aliter se habere, quandoquidem id Deus revelaverit, &c. whilst this Act non cognoscit necitiâ ullâ plane infallibili cui falsum subesse nequit, se esse supernaturalem, &c.* Concerning the certitude of adhesion also all agree; 1st, That it exceeds the Evidence which such person hath of the infallibility of the external proof, or Motive of his Faith. And 2ly. That this adhesion is not effected in such person *sine concursu auxilii supernaturalis,**

pernaturalis, or sine motione Gratia Divina, I say; whatever Resolution, or appreciation the will, in such act, is said by them to have, whereby it advanceth the assent also of the Intellect beyond the proof, or Intellectual-motive, Yet this they hold the Will to have from the supernatural concurrence Divine, it receives from above. — *Ea ipso* (saith the same Bacon ||) *quod proponatur alicui* || Disp. 3. c. veritas aliqua ut a Deo revelata, iis vestita argumentis, ut prudenter, 7. p. 177. hic, & nunc, possit ac debeat acceptari ut divina; si reipsa sit revelata a Deo, Deus infundit auxilium supernaturale ad credendum sicut oportet, ad salutem; atque ita evadit actus supernaturalis, atque certissimus, &c. [certissimus, i.e. adhesion only, not infallibilitate evidemia, and this adhesion ab auxilio supernaturali: i.e. ex operatione Spiritus Sancti. He goes on]. At si revelata non sit; esto, probabiliter proponatur: Deus tamen auxilium supernaturale non confert. So He out of many other Catholick Authors cited by Him. p. 173. & 178.

Thus *Fa. Knott* † (in his Reply to Mr. Chillingworth) 9. 132. affirming Christians may have a true infallible divine faith, of † p. 339: which faith they have only a fallible proponent, nor are infallibly certain thereof, i.e. as to the proponent. — From the unlearned (saith he) God exacts no more, but that they proceed prudently according to the measure of their several capacities; and use such diligence, as men ought in a matter of highest moment. All Christians of the primitive Church were not present when the Apostles spoke, or wrote; yea it is not certain, that every one of those thousands, whom S. Peter converted, did hear every sentence he spoke, but might believe some by relation of others, who stood near — And (c. 1. p. 64.) the same Author saith; That a Preacher, or Pastor, whose testimonies are humane, and fallible, when they declare to their hearers, or subjects, what some truth is witnessed by God's Word, are an occasion, what those people may produce a true infallible act of faith, depending immediately upon Divine Revelation applied by the said means. — And — If you object (saith he) that perhaps that humane authority is false, and proposeth to my understanding divine Revelation, when God doth not reveal, therefore, I cannot, upon humane testimony representing, or applying Divine Revelation, exercise an infallible act of faith, I answer; it is one thing, whether by a reflex act I am absolutely certain, that I exercise an infallible act of faith; and another, whether indeed, and in actu exercito I produce such an act. Of the former I have said nothing, neither makes it to our present purpose. Of the latter I affirm, that, when indeed humane testimony is true [though not certainly known to me to be so] and so applies a Divine Revelation which really exists: in such a case I may believe, by a true infallible assent of Christian faith. The Reason of this seems clear: because although a truth, which

I know only by a probable assent, is not certain, to me; yet, in it self, it is most immovable and certain. — Neither will God be wanting to concur on the Believers part with his special Grace necessary for producing a supernatural act of Christian Faith. And afterward p. 65. Beside the object [of faith] of infinite authority on the Believers part, God doth infuse the habit of faith; he gives a particular actual motion of Grace for exercising the act thereof; he effectually moves the Will by a pious affection and command to determine the Understanding to a firm assent of Faith, above the precedent arguments of credibility. And p. 94. in answer to Chillingworth pressing him, that faith can rise to no higher certainty than its Motive hath, — If you mean (faith he) that the assent which we give merely for the arguments of credibility considered in themselves is no stronger than those arguments can make it, This we willingly grant: but absolutely deny, that Divine Faith is measured by those arguments, and not by Divine Revelation, and Gods supernatural Grace. Again p. 358. — A man may exercise (faith he) an infallible act of faith, though his immediate instructor or proposer be not infallible, because he believes upon a ground, which both is believed by him to be infallible, and is such indeed, to wit, the Word of God: who therefore will not deny his supernatural concurrence necessary to every act of divine faith. Otherwise (faith he) in the ordinary course there would be no means left for the faith and salvation of unlearned persons. Now in all these expressions of F. Knot the Reader may observe, that he grounds the infallible assent of a Divine Faith only on the infallibility of its object, Divine Revelation; and the supernatural concurrence or operation of Gods Spirit effecting a most indissoluble adherence to it; where is no known infallibility of a Proponeat.

§. 133. Thus *Quam* speaking more particularly of this internal efficient, the Holy Spirit. — *Se generaliter quæritur (faith he) unde fidei constet, et quæ fidei certitudo sit a Deo revelata, non potest Ecclesie auctoritatem [i.e. infallibilem] inducere, quia unum de revelatis est, Ecclesiam errare non posse [Non poterit, i.e. as this Proposition: Ecclesia non potest errare] is the object of a divine faith, from the Scriptures declaring it assisted with the holy Ghost; and not the object of an acquiescent faith, from the prudential motives, as the same Church is illustris congregatio hominum prudentium, &c.] — Again Ib. — *Ultima fidei nostre resolutio fit in causam interiorem efficientem, hoc est, in Deum moventem ad credendum. — Itaque ex parte objecti ratio formalis movens est divina veritas revelans; sed illa tamen non sufficit ad movendum, nisi adhibeatur aliter, hoc est, Deus etiam movens per gratiarum spiritumque conconsensum. — And quamvis utique competentes, ea que sunt fidei proponantur, necessaria est infusio per.**

per causa interior, hoc est, divinum quoddam lumen incitans ad credendum—Where he urgeth, 1. Cor. 12. c.—Nemo potest dicere Dominus Iesus, nisi in spiritu sancto; And, Gal. 1. c. the adherence to this faith not to be shaken by the contrary testimony of men, and Angels; and, that our faith must be the very same with that of the Apostles (who received the matter believed immediately from God) in its essence, and, as to the formal object, and internal efficient thereof; however the external motives thereof do vary: by which infused and divine faith also he saith, we believe Deum esse verum or Ecclesiam non posse errare much more firmly, and certainly, than we can believe them by any acquired faith from the prudential motives, which we have thereof.

And of the same matter thus Layman, in the place before quoted—Major, imò maxima, & certissima animi adhesio, quam fides divina continet, non ex viribus natura aut humanis persuasionibus provenit; sed ab auxilio Spiritus sancti, succurrentis intellectui & libera voluntati nostræ. And, speaking of the understanding and the will's accepting of the first Divine Revelation, beyond which it can proceed no further, discursively, to any former Revelation—Acceptat (saith he) intellectus prima veritatis testimonium 1°. Per scientiam infusam; quâ intellectus elevatur evidenter perscipiat revelationem a primâ veritate fieri, &c. 2°. Per actum fidei immediatum, ad quem eliciendum (i. e. acceptandum, seu credendum, revelationem a primâ veritate esse); extrinsecè prærequiruntur humana motiva, quibus acquisita fides inmittitur: intrinsecè verò, & in genere causa efficientis, requiritur Spiritus sancti gratia supplens, quod humane infirmitati ad supernaturalem infallibilem fidei assensum eliciendum deest. [I add, per quam gratiam fides divina produciatur.] Here scientia infusa, and, Spiritus sancti gratia are made the first Operators of divine faith, or assent, to the first Revelation. This for the internal efficient of divine faith; as for the external first principle thereof—Quod verò (saith he) ad firmamentum fidei resolutionem attinet, expeditus, ac verus dicendi modus est iste apud Cajetan 2. 2. q. 1. 2. 1. Quod fides divina, ex parte objecti, ac motivi formalis, resolvatur in auctoritatem Dei revelantis: Credo, Deum esse incarnatum; Ecclesia deservientis auctoritatem infallibilem esse; quia prima, & summa, veritas revelavit. Deum autem veracem talia nobis revelasse ulterius resolvit, vel per fidem [i. e. divinam] probari non potest, nec debet: Quandoquidem principia resolutionis non probantur, sed supponuntur. [Conely, as he said before; maxima & certissima animi adhesio to this ultimate Divine Revelation, provenit ab auxilio Spiritus sancti; succurrentis intellectui, &c.] But now, a fides hyemigna, or acquired, lean upon, and give a further

ther ground or motive, inductive to a Divine Faith, and this a motive too, sufficiently certain, viz. the *Consent of the Church*, (as understood in the latter sense mentioned §. 126.) or *universal Tradition*. Of which he goes on thus—*Verum, in ordine ad nos, revelatio divina credibilis & acceptabilis fit per extrinseca motiva; inter qua unum ex præcipuis meritis censetur autoritas & consensus Ecclesie tot sæculis, tanto numero hominum clarissimorum florentis*. But then, this evident, or morally-infallible, motive, is not held always necessary neither as an humane induction to divine faith. For he proceeds—*Quamvis id non unicum, nec simpliciter necessarium motivum est; quandoquidem non omnes eodem modo, sed alii aliter ad fidem Christi amplectendam moventur, &c.* See also *Suarez* ||, speaking of the Divine Faith of simple and illiterate people.—*Adde, si contingat exteriorem prædicationem fidei, & propositionem non esse sufficientem ad formandum iudicium firmum & evidens de Credibilitate fidei vel absolutâ vel comparatâ cum aliâ doctrinâ, [the case of these simple people] tunc per divinam inspirationem & vocationem internam posse compleri huiusmodi credibilitatem. Ita sumo ex D. Tho. Quodl. 2. Art. 1. Ubi dicit: Quamvis ordinariè Fides fiat credibilis per miracula & alia externa signa, nihilominus sine illis posse Deum per vocationem internam propositionem complere juxta illud Jo. 6. — Omnis, qui audit a Patre, & didicit, venit ad me.* Now what is this but an adhesion to the Articles of Faith by operation of the Holy Spirit, beyond any rational external evidence received of them? This being said of a Divine Faith in the several assertions precedent. That it is grounded always as to its formal object on Divine Revelation, and produced in us by the operation of the Holy Ghost: But that it is not necessary also that such faith always have an external rationally infallible ground or motive thereto (either Church-Authority, or any other) on his part that so believes.

§. 134. n. 1.

7.

7. Yet 7^{ly}. It is also affirmed, that there are always some rational and sufficiently self-evident and certain grounds or Motives producible both for the Christian Religion and Faith, in general; and for all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church; clearly evidencing, both, ¹ that those are truly Divine, and not false, Revelations, on which this our Faith chiefly relies, and into which primarily it resolves it self; and ² that this our faith is wrought in us by the Holy, and not a seducing, spirit; and ³ that also the supreme Proponents of this our Faith are by the Divine Providence, in what necessary truth they teach, preserved infallible. Which rational Grounds, or any equall to them, no other

ther Religion besides Christianity, nor, in Christianity, no other Sect, or seducing private Spirit, out of the Catholick Church, can possibly plead, or pretend to. So that, though many seducing spirits, as it were in emulation of the Holy One, do offer to set up themselves for assurers of a Divine Faith; and many times do effect so firm an adherence to most false revelations, as that from this perswasion many have exposed themselves even to suffer death in defence of their errours; yet this ever remains a constant way of distinguishing to the world and to all mens reason a true Divine Faith wrought by Gods Holy Spirit, from these counterfeit ones wrought by the evil spirit, that Catholicks, for this Divine Faith (which the Holy Ghost only works in them, as to such a supernatural powerful, and vivifical, efficacy thereof, yet) always have besides such internal efficacy, many extrinsecal motives and assurances to render this faith (called Divine, from its object, and efficient) a Faith rationally certain, credible, and acceptable to themselves, and others, I mean still the former Tradition and *Motives*; which, (when as the internal plerophory of this Faith, wrought by the Spirit, is not publickly conspicuous, or manifest abroad, Nor can this Faith at any time be resolved into it as any Ground or proof thereof) are a standing rational evidence of the verity of Christianity, against all other Sects of Religion, and against all Hereticks. And the ordinary way, Gods Spirit makes use of, for producing this Divine Faith, is from an acquiste faith grounded on the Motives, that precedes it *Fides*. [i.e. Divina] *ex auditu*. And Vasquez concerning it delivers further || that—*ex communi sententia Theologorum, posito priori illo [assensu Fidei humanæ] quo credimus predicatori vel proponenti mysteria, statim conceditur posterior assensus, [i.e. Divinæ Fidei] qui nititur proximè principio illo, Deus dicit: Nec ulli unquam habenti priorem assensum denegatur posterior.* Thus He.

As therefore before in the production of a Divine Faith the Believers Syllogisme or reasoning || runs thus—Whatever God reveals to us is most certainly true; God hath revealed this or this; *Ergo*, this is most certainly true: So here in the production of a rational or acquiste Faith the Syllogisme is this—Whatsoever such an universal Tradition before mentioned, accompanied with such other Motives or circumstances (considered here only according to their own self-credit, and evidence, and cutting off from any certainty accruing to them from the Divine assistance, a thing not yet known to a new Convert) deliver to be Gods truth, is Gods Truth; But such Tradition, and such Motives have delivered such and such things as Gods truth; *Ergo* they are Gods Truth.

Now

§. 134. m. 2.
|| In 1a 2e
disp. 201.
c. 2.

|| See before.
§. 124.

Now, in both these Premises (where you see is no mention at all of the *Holy Spirit* to the Believer, or *Divine assistance* to the Proposer) is pleaded a self-evidence sufficient for grounding Faith. The self-evidence of the *Minor* lies in matter of fact; and is, if questioned, to be confirmed by several particular instances, and Inductions. The self-evidence of the *Major* is conceded by Protestants without any dispute, they granting that upon this evidence they hold the Scriptures. And since there is such an universal accord among Christians concerning the *Major*, that it is a certainty abundantly sufficient, it seems but an impertinency to trouble our selves about the exact manner, or degree, of this certainty of Tradition and the Motives, as they do first introduce any into the Catholick Faith, before he is yet acquainted with any Divine Revelation of Gods perpetual assisting his Church, in the veracity of its testimony, with his Holy Spirit.

§. 134. n. 3.

Yet, if any thing more may be expected to be said concerning it particularly, whether it be a not-morally- (or not naturally-if you will; but then, naturally must be understood of such an Agent as works not necessarily, but with freewill,) or else a not-possibly-infallible certainty that resides in such Tradition and motives; 1st. I answer, That, abstracting from any Divine superintendency, the Christian world is agreed, that there is a certainty in these Motives equall to the certainty of such Humane Traditions as these, That there was such a Person as *Julius Caesar*, or *Henry the Eighth*; or is such a Country as *Italy*, or *Spain*, to such as have not seen them. Now of these last named Traditions some Catholics stick not to say, that they are not-possibly-fallible, or that they are impossible to be false; & the vulgar language concerning such Traditions concurs with them. And so from this they may also justly affirm the same of that Tradition, whereon we ground Faith. See for this Dr *Holden* ||; who resolving Faith into Church-

|| *Analys.*

fid. 1. c. 8.

p. 133.

Tradition affirms the falsity also of merely humane Traditions. *Quæ ad convenientem & debitum Universitatis gradum assurgunt*, such as these, *Fuisse Imperatores Romanos*, or *Julium Cæsarem*, or *Angliam a Gulielmo Normannia Duce subjugatam*, to be a thing planè impossible. So Mr *White* †. So *Faith Vindicated*, p. 73. — *Humane Faith may rise to that degree of stability that mankind would think him mad, i. e. a renouncer of evident reason, who can think seriously, that it can be an error, or possible to be false: for example, the belief of this present age concerning the existence of France, or King James. And see Arch-bishop Lawd using the same language* || — *I must tell you, a man may be assured, nay infallibly assured by Ecclesiastical & humane Proof; Men that never saw Rome may be sure and infallibly believe, that*

† *Dialog.* 3.

12.

|| §. 19. n. 1.

that such a City there is by Historical and acquired Faith.

And Dr Stillingfleet, in stilling this certainty of Tradition a Moral Certainty, yet, having a like interest in it (as Catholicks) for making it a foundation of proving the Scriptures to be the Word of God, thus endeavours to exalt it, *Rat. Account.* p. 206. 207. — *That Moral certainty may be as great as Mathematical and Physical, supposing as little reason to doubt in moral things as to their natures, as in Mathematical and Physical as to their's. And -- That, for all that he knows, the greatest Physical certainty is as liable to question as Moral; there being as great a possibility of deception in that, as a suspicion of doubt in this; and oftentimes greater. And p. 196. he grants the evidence of this Tradition such a certainty as excludes all possibility of reasonable doubting, and after styles it a rational infallibility — If no more (saith he) be meant but a kind of rational infallibility (though those terms be not very proper) i.e. so great evidence, as if I question it, I may upon equal grounds question every thing which mankind yields the firmest assent to; because I cannot imagine that so great a part of the wisest and most considerative part of the world should be so grossly deceived in a matter of such moment (especially supposing a Divine Providence) [where you see, he also strengthens this Tradition with the Divine Assistance], then I freely and heartily assent, We have such a kind of rational infallibility or rather the highest degree of actual certainty concerning the truth of the Canon of Scripture. Nay he proceeds yet further and saith — That from the credibility of Christian Religion [gathered from this Tradition] the infallible truth of it may be [not believed only, but] proved. [Where he seems to me (I leave the judgment thereof to the ingenious Reader perusing this passage in him) to incur the same absurdity he usually objects to Catholicks viz. that they build an infallible assent of faith only upon the credibility of the Motives; i.e. make the Conclusion stronger than the Premises. Now if he can draw the infallible truth of that which we believe from the same credibility of the Motives; I think an infallible assent in our faith of it will also generally follow.]*

And thus he endeavours there to make this good. — Where (saith he) there is evident credibility in the matter propounded there doth arise upon men an obligation to believe. Which Proposition is willingly granted him [And this is a thing said before by Chillingworth c. 6. §. 8. — Though I deny (saith he) that it is required of us to be infallibly certain of the truth of the things which we believe — Yet I deny not that we are and may be infallibly certain that we are to believe the Religion of Christ. For first, this is most certain, that we are in all things to do according to wisdom and reason, rather

than against it. 2ly. This is as certain, that wisdom & reason require, that we should believe these things which are by many degrees more credible and probable than the contrary. 3ly This is as certain, that to every man who considers impartially what great things may be said for the truth of Christianity, and what poor things they are which may be said against it, either for any other Religion, or for none at all, it cannot but appear by many degrees more credible, that Christian Religion is true, than the contrary. Thus he.] Then Dr. St. subsumes—
That where there is such an obligation [i.e. from God] to believe, we have the greatest assurance that the matter to be believed is infallibly true: Which depends upon this manifest proof. That God cannot oblige men to believe a ly. Now this Assumption or Minor Proposition *That there is such an obligation, &c.* is manifestly false. Because the obligation we have from God to believe a thing may be either as infallibly true, or only as credibly true, according to the quality and strength of the proof, upon which he obligeth us so to believe it. Otherwise this arguing would also prove, that we are obliged by God to believe all things infallibly true, when they are only proved credible to us, and that upon the credibility only of such a proof. But God only upon a credible proof obliges us to believe a thing credibly true; which obligation well consists with a possibility (though not credibility) of such thing its being false. And the Confirmation he adds to it, *That God cannot oblige men to believe a ly,* being granted, yet consists well with this, God's obliging us upon a credible proof to believe a thing only as credible. For, though in the things themselves every Proposition is either infallibly true, or infallibly false, and a ly; Yet, as things fall under our knowledge there are several mediums between these two: and propositions according to the knowledge or proof we have of them may be said to be either infallibly true, or false; or most probably true, yet possible to be false, or the contrary; or equally uncertain, and doubtful, whether true, or false. From which it appears, God doth not oblige us either to believe a thing infallibly certain, or else a lie. Upon this supposition therefore; that our moral certainty, or assurance, on which we ground the verity of Christian Religion, involves a possibility of falshood, God doth not oblige us to believe Christian Religion with an acquiescent or rational faith from this moral certainty as freed from all possibility of falshood, or as absolutely infallible; but to believe, in the same degree, the one to be credible, as we do the other; in the same degree, Christian Religion true, as we do the ground thereof, and no further. It is true, that God obligeth us upon the evidence of such a Tradition to believe such Revelations his Word,

Word, and so infallible; But he hath not obliged us to believe such Revelations to be proved to be his Word, or proved infallibly true (which is the Doctors assertion) from a medium that is only credible.

Meanwhile all that is here affirmed is, that, such as the Evidence of the Tradition and Motives is, said to be, such is the Evidence of that Faith that is built upon them, and that this evidence of a Tradition so qualified is abundantly sufficient for a rational ground of Faith, and for producing such an assurance of Christian Religion as God requires us to have of it by an acquire and rational faith. And, if the sense of their expressions, who affirm this evidence of Tradition *impossible to be false*, be mitigated so, as to mean [not absolutely, but] only, speaking of men, generally *impossible to be so*; and then mean by *naturally* the generally natural good inclination of men (as to the most of them, if not, all) to speak truth, or at least not maliciously to ly, or all conspire in such lying in a matter, where all their interests are against it, we are all agreed in sense, and any further contention about the word *impossible* will only be a logomachy. §. 135. n. 5.

But 2ly. I chuse rather, with the former common School-language, to stile these Motives not-morally-fallible; because in speaking of a bare and rigid possibility, considering the ability and power that is in mans nature as endued with a will free both to contraries and contradictories, all men whatever, whether divided or united, have it in their power to ly, or endeavour to deceive; though here is granted on the other side such a rectitude still remaining in their nature, at least for the most of men, as renders it morally speaking impossible, that they should do so. And again, If we should advance these Motives or this Tradition, as to its own self-evidency, any higher, I see not but * that upon this we may supersede both the Divine assistance to this Proponent of Faith, which Proponent without it will be (as such other Humane Traditions are) even of it self not-possibly-fallible; and supersede also the operation of Gods Spirit for begetting such a firmness of Faith in the hearts of those persons, who have such a Proponent already known to them to be so infallible; and lastly, * that the dependence and reliance, which Faith may have on this Tradition, as to matter of Truth, will equall that it hath on Divine Revelation; because neither of these is possibly fallible. §. 135. n. 6.

Now, since this Moral certainty, we affirm, is a certainty natural to men (not that they absolutely cannot, but, according to the common goodness of mens manners, will not do otherwise) and is far beyond any probability, because it admits in it no man-

ner of a reasonable doubting; nor is there any argument, that gives any shew of truth to the contrary of it; and since it is the greatest certainty that can be given us concerning a thing done and past, as the subject of Faith and Religion, we now speak of, is; (*viz.* concerning such Miracles done; concerning our Lord and his Apostles sent from God; their delivering such and such Doctrines): unless God would cause our Lord and his Apostles to abide here always, and to preach to all men in all ages the same doctrine and shew Miracles also to confirm them: Or unless he would at least take from man any further power of telling a ly; or unless he would again accompany their relation with the same Miracles, to be beheld by every one in all times to whom Christianity is proposed, that our Lord and his Apostles did: (for I can devise no other waies how God may give us an Evidence more infallible than this affords): Again, since it is such an evidence, as no other Sect whatever can shew for their Religion the same, or the like: Lastly, since such an external humane evidence, as is less than this, through the internal operation of Gods Spirit, sufficeth for the begetting of a Divine and saving Faith in the younger and simpler sort of people, namely the testimony, for the truth of their religion, which they have from such persons as are of a most credible authority with them (though possibly fallible) such as are their Parents, their Tutors, or their Parish-Priest, as hath been shewed before. || All these things I say well considered, I see not, why any further or higher certainty should be desired as an Introductive to the Catholick Faith; where is an abstraction made from any supernatural assistance to these Motives, which supernatural assistance is not discovered to us till afterward by those Divine Revelations, that the first Motives, or Proponents, deliver to us. But then, if any after all this can make good any further certainty in such Tradition, I know no party, if Christian, that hath any interest to oppose him: for, all those who deny the Motives to be not impossible to be false, and affirm them to be only morally certain, yet freely acknowledge a general obligation upon all men, from this moral certainty of them, to believe the truth of the Christian Religion: and then the stronger any one else can make this Faith, they have all reason to like it the better.

U. §. 129.

§. 136.

This of the Principle contained in the first Premise, or Major, the certainty of these Motives, or of Church-Tradition. We come next to consider the Minor, or second Premise, what things Church-Tradition or Motives have delivered to us as Divine Truths, and how far, as to the matters maintained either in the Christian, or in the Catholick Profession, the certainty of such

such Tradition may be extended, and doth secure us.

And here ist. A rational certainty of a Christians Faith at least for this main Point, that the Scriptures (I mean, as to the main body of them, those few books being set aside, which the Protestants call Apocryphal) are the Word of God ; and, consequently, that whatever is contained therein, and all the Articles of the Christian Faith grounded thereon, are infallible, is affirmed by Protestants, who declare also this Certainty to arise from that plenary Church-Tradition, which is found to have delivered these to be God's word, and Divine Revelation, throughout all Ages from the Apostles times ; which Apostles confirmed them with Miracles. Of which thus the Archbishop—*If you speak (saith he to A. C.) of assurance only in general [and not of that by a Divine Faith] I must then make bold to tell you (and it is the greatest advantage which the Church of Christ hath against Infidels) a man may be assured, nay infallibly assured by Ecclesiastical and humane proof. Men that never saw Rome may be sure, and infallibly believe, that such a City there is, by historical, and acquired Faith. And, if consent of humane Story can assure me this ; why should not consent of Church-Story assure me the other ; That Christ and his Apostles delivered this Body of Scripture as the Oracles of God ? And again, — Certain it is (saith he) that by humane authority, consent, and proof a man may be assured infallibly, that the Scripture is the Word of God, by an acquired habit of Faith, cui non subest falsum [i.e. Speaking of an usual, and constant moral certainty and non-falsity of things] but he cannot be assured infallibly and by Divine Faith, cui subesse non potest falsum but by a Divine Testimony. And see in him p. 330. cited before, §. 127. n. 2. And thus Mr Chillingworth, p. 36. A constant famous and very general Tradition so credible that no wise man doubts of any other, which hath but the fortieth part of the credibility of this, such and so credible a Tradition tells us, that God hath set his hand and seal to the truth of the Christian Doctrine by doing great and glorious and frequent miracles in confirmation of it.*

A sufficient certainty then Protestants acknowledge of this Tradition concerning Scripture, & consequently concerning all the Articles of Christian Faith that are built on Scripture. Upon which ground also they freely grant, || That if any other point, wherein they dissent from Catholicks can be proved by as universal a Tradition as that of the Scriptures, they will subscribe to it. || See Collins, p. 114. Still-ling p. 226.

Again the same sufficient certainty is maintained by Catholicks to be in this Tradition for whatever it delivers ; but without all they urge several motives of credibility concurring with

§. 137.

it p.

† See before
§. 127.

it, which are not so much insisted on by Protestants, some of which Motives may add to a Tradition of a less latitude a moral certainty as great, or greater, from the dignity of the persons, as a more universal Tradition may have, from the multitude of Testators; amongst which motives also are the Miracles done in several ages by such Persons.

Which true Miracles, done in any age, are (or else they were not in the Apostles times) to so many as see them a Motive infallible of the truth of that Religion, which such Persons, as do them, profess; but to others, who see them not, but receive them only by Tradition descending from those Persons who beheld them, are a Motive, the evidence whereof depends on the moral infallibility of the Tradition. And this Tradition of such Miracles, if only Oral (for, a written Tradition, whether ancienter, or later, hath always the same evidence) is the more creditable still, as it doth by fewer men, or a shorter line of Tradition come to us. For, a thing received by word, or Writing, at the first hand from a person of much veracity, professing to have seen it, must needs beget a stronger faith in us, than the same at the sixth, or seventh, if any of the intermediate conveyers happen not to be persons of the same fidelity. And therefore new Miracles successively from age to age done in the Catholick Church, of which a shorter Tradition, *ceteris paribus*, affords a clearer evidence, serve for a very great confirmation of its Faith. And here, as those who see Miracles have a Motive infallible of the truth of the Religion taught by those Persons doing them, so all those who come to the knowledge of such Miracles by the relation of others, provided this Relation be such as, the persons and circumstances considered, is morally infallible, have at this time as infallible a Ground of the Catholickness of their Faith from the present Church teaching it wherein these Miracles are done, as all those persons had who received their Faith from the Apostles themselves, if these were not Spectators (as the most then doubtless were not) of these Miracles, but were assured of them from other persons sufficiently credible. And it seems a great Mercy of the Divine Providence in behalf of his true Church, that as no other Churches have Miracles besides it, so neither do they now scarce feign or pretend them: and that this Mark remains preserved to it from being counterfeited by any others.

§. 138.

By these *Miracles* then and the other *Motives* abovenamed Catholicks also affirm that the true Religion may be rationally evident and discerned from all false ones, whether they be *within*, or *without*, the pale of Christianity; none of which Sects can produce

duce a like evidence for their faith: and that by these our Faith is demonstrated a Rational Service, *Rom. 12. 1. 1 Pet. 3. 4.* Into this Tradition and Motives likewise is acknowledged to be the last Resolution of a Christians Faith, as to the rational ground and proof thereof (though this Ground no Object of our Faith, as it is called Divine); and that the certainty of our faith (Divine, or Humane) as to its evidence, is no greater than this Tradition affords, on which it is grounded: which thing as Protestants much contend for, so Catholicks allow. — *Assensus cognoscitivus non potest excedere certitudinem principii, quo nititur*: faith Layman ||. And well || *Theol. Mor.* faith D. Holden † — *Majorem certitudinem veram & rationalem* [*i. ral. p. 183. e. as to evidence*] *habere non posse quemcunque assensum fidei, etiam divina, quam habeat assensus mediis, quo hujusce fidei objectum intel-* *Fid. l. 1. c. 3. lectui applicatur.* — *Impossibile est ut majori certitudine verâ & rationali credat aliquis ea, quæ dicuntur, a Deo revelari, quam quâ cognoverit Deum eâ revelasse. Qualis namque incertitudinis vel dubii gradus inest existimationi seu cognitioni credentis de mediis certitudinis & veritate, eundem penitus necessarium est inesse assensui, quo creditur ea quæ proposita sunt per tale medium.* And this also is willingly granted, that, if such Tradition be a sufficient Ground or proof for clearing the Scriptures, or the Church's Infallibility, so will it be also for evidencing any other point of Faith whatever, for which an equal plenitude of Tradition can be produced.

Concerning such a Certainty then in Tradition, and a sufficient certainty to our Faith from it, needs be no contention. But concerning what latitude and universality Tradition as to many particulars requires to render it sufficiently certain and self-evident, is a matter somewhat harder to judge. But, meanwhile, the Protestant's declining the admission of any that happen to be less universal than that of Scripture, seems not reasonable. Because of two Traditions, whereof one appears more universal than the other, yet the lesser also may have a sufficient certainty in it whereon to build a rational belief; and hence Protestants may have reason enough to admit several other Traditions, as well as that of Scripture, though these not all equally universal; or any so universal, as that of the Scriptures. For, the Wars of *Cæsar* and *Pompey* descend by a more universal Tradition, namely that both of Christians and Mahometans, than this, that the Bible is Gods Word: and yet this latter carries with it a sufficient evidence; and Protestants themselves † do both allow, and practise, several Traditions as Apostolical; which yet have not the same fulness of Tradition, as the Scriptures; nor indeed more, than several of those points have, whereof yet they deny a sufficient Tradition. *See Disc. 2. §. 40. n. 21.*

gain,

|| §. 121.

gani, the Tradition of a smaller number of persons, if eminent in sanctity, and miracles, and other forenamed || Motives of credit, may be as, or more, credible, than that of a greater number not so qualified. Of several other Traditions then, what, or how many, in particular carry a sufficient fulness, and evidence in them (though all do not the same) to beget a rational belief, I know no way how privat men may safelier learn this than from the Church. From the Church I say, after that, first, at least its authority & infallibility is established by the Scriptures, or by Tradition. Thus much of the 7th. Proposition concerning a rational certainty in Tradition qualified with the Motives for establishing Faith; and, of the Protestants urging it as to the evidencing that the Scriptures (at least the Books of it called by the Protestants Canonical) are the Word of God.

§. 140.

8.

8. But, since This certainty of Tradition (allowed by Protestants) for Scripture's being God's Word, and whatever is contained in it, infallible, is insufficient to assure to Christians their faith in several Articles thereof, because, wherever the *sense* of these Scriptures is ambiguous, it will still be uncertain, whether such Articles of our faith be grounded on the *true* sense, which only is God's Word, or on the *mistaken* sense, which is not so: And since neither can such an express Tradition as may be to all persons self-evident (for so it must be, if they are to learn such Articles of their faith, wherein Scriptures are dubious, only from it) be produced for many of those wherein the sense of Scriptures is controverted. Next, therefore, Catholicks proceed farther yet: And, both from the same Scriptures (thus established), and from other constant Tradition descending from the Apostles (for both which see the proofs given before Disc. 1. §. 7. -- Disc. 2. §. 18. & Disc. 3. §. 7, 8, 87. &c.) do also gather and firmly believe an infallibility in the Church, or its Governours, for all necessities from a promised perpetual assistance of the holy Ghost.

And this Article of the infallibility of the Church thus established becomes to them a new ground of their faith, from which they do most firmly believe, and adhere to, all the rest of those Articles of their faith, wherein either the Divine Revelation of Scriptures or of Apostolical Tradition is not so perspicuous and clear to them, as it is in this other Article of the Church's infallibility: And, from this infallibility of the Church believed, all the definitions of the same Church, that are made in points where the true sense of Scriptures is in controversy, and that are delivered by her as infallible and Divine Revelations, are straight believed as such; and, among others, these points

points also, (when the Church in any doubtful case defines them) what books do belong to the *Canon of Scriptures*, or, what *Traditions*; and *Apostolical*: And even this touching the sense of those Scriptures that testify the Church's Infalibility: for whoever is first proved to us to be infallible in what he saith is to be believed in this also, when he saith he is infallible. And this Church-Infalibility, learnt once from a clear Tradition, confers a much greater certainty of faith as to many Articles in our relying on it, than if we depended herein only on such an imperfect Tradition, as many Christians may only have of them.

Thus, if I first receive and believe the Church-infalibility from a clear Apostolical Tradition; descending by the testimony of Posterity to the age afterward, from this Church-infalibility defining it, I may become straight assured of the Canon of Scripture.

Or 2ly. If I receive, and believe some part of the Canon of Scripture from clear Apostolical Tradition, and out of this received Canon become assured of Church-infalibility, from the descending traditive sense of this Canon declaring so much, afterward, from this infalibility defining it, I may certainly come to know other parts of the same Canon that are more questioned. Again: when I have already learned the Church-infalibility from the Scriptures, as traditionally understood, afterward I may become, from Church-definitions, sealed in the belief of all those Articles of faith, wherein the expressions of the same Scriptures (though believed by me before the Church's infalibility, yet) being ambiguous in their sense, (which sense properly, and not the words, is the Divine Revelation) can beget no certain, and firm faith in me until they are expounded by the Church infallibly relating, from God's Spirit assisting it, the traditive sense of them to me: So that, though I believe the infalibility of Scriptures as well as the Church; yet, in so many points, wherein the meaning of the Scriptures is not clear to me, I receive the firmness of my faith in them, not from the infalibility of the Scripture's expression of that which is God's Word, but of the Church expounding them. If then the Scripture, or Tradition-Apostolick, that descends to the present age, be clearer for this of Church-infalibility, than for some other points of faith, that person must necessarily be conceded to have a firmer ground of his faith for so many points, who believes the *Church infallible*, than another, who believes only *Scripture* so; and such person also is preserved in a right faith in these points, when the other not only may err in his *Faith*, but become *heretical* in his error, by opposing the definition of the Church. So, had the *Arrians*, and *Nestorians* believed the

§. 141.

Church infallible, this Article of their faith, firm and stedfast, had preserved them from *Heresie* in some others.

§. 142.

Here then appears a great fixtness and stability of the *Catholicks* Faith, by reason of this Church-infallibility, for many points, wherein the *Protestants* faith fluctuates, and varies. For, whilst the Protestant only extends, and makes use of, the certitude of the *Church-Tradition*, as to one of these points, the *delivery* of the *Scriptures*; and acknowledgeth no further certitude of the same Church-Tradition, written (in the *Scriptures*), or unwritten, for the other point, the *infallibility* of the *Church* divinely assisted, in the exposition of the same *Scriptures*, and in the discerning of true Traditions; And again, while the sense of these *Scriptures* in many weighty points (as experience shews) hath been, and is controverted; the *Protestant* here, for so many of these points, as are, upon such misinterpretation of *Scripture*, defined by the Church (in the definition of which Church, assisted (as he believes) by the holy Ghost, the *Catholick* remains secure), hath no rational Anchor, nor ground of confidence in his faith, but that which rests upon the certainty of his own judgment concerning the *sense* of God's Word, and *truth* of Tradition; and that judgment of his too, for several points of his faith, going against the judgment, and exposition of the *major* part of the present Church, and against his *Superiors*. Where the last refuge Protestants betake themselves to ordinarily, is saying, — *That in all things necessary, the sense of Scripture is not ambiguous, but clear enough even to the unlearned; and that in points not necessary, there is no necessity of a right faith, or of any decision of controversies; and so no need of an infallible Church, or any unerring Guide, save Scriptures; which defence hath been examined, in Disc. 2. §. 38. &c.*

§. 143.

From things thus cleared I think any difficulties in the Objection, to which I shall now apply my Discourse more closely, will be easily dispelled.

The grand Error that runs through the Objection is the mistake of this Proposition supposed to be maintained by *Catholicks*, viz. That a Divine Faith must be grounded, not only as to its *Object*, but *Evidence* or *Proof*, on a *Divine Revelation*; which hath an unavoidable absurdity following it; either a proceeding in the proof of the Divine Revelations *in infinitum*, or proving them round in a Circle, or at least believing some one Divine Revelation without any ground, reason, or proof at all that it is truly such, and not counterfeit.

§. 144.

Here therefore *Catholicks* affirm: But so do Protestants al-

To,

so; That a Divine Faith for its formal Object must always rely on Divine Revelation or Gods Word and his Veracity; and is finally resolved into it. But

2ly. Deny, That, in this Resolution of a Divine Faith, any further proof or evidence of this its object, that it is truly a Divine Revelation, than that which Tradition circumstantiated with the Motives affords, is necessary.

3ly. That, as for the expression used by Protestants, as well as Catholicks, of an *infallible assent* given in a Divine Faith; as such infallibility respects not the Object, the things believed to be Gods word and so most infallible on which it relies, but the Subject believing, no more is meant by it, than either the infallibility which the forementioned Tradition exhibites, or a certitude of adhesion to its Object, wrought, in such a Faith, by the operation of Gods Spirit, transcending that certainty we have of other things the most scientificall and infallible.

4ly. That Church-Infallibility as divinely assisted and believed to be not possibly liable to delivering any error in necessities, is one of the Articles of the Christian Faith, and grounded, as others, on the evidence or proof of the foresaid Tradition, which Tradition is self-evident & certain unto us on another account than that of the Traditioners being supernaturally assisted: viz. on this; that it is contrary to Humane Nature that such a multitude of such Persons so qualified should generally conspire in propagating to posterity any falshood. And that, whatever strength of faith we have of the former Church Infallibility, yet no further provable assurance have we of it, than this certainty of the Motives affords. But neither is such an assurance, as these Motives afford, necessary to all persons believing with a Divine and saving Faith: as hath been shewed before, *Prop. 6. §. 129. n. 3.*

§. 145.

Nor do the Degrees of such a Faith, as to a greater love and adherence to its object, and as to the assurance of it, necessarily correspond so, but that this Faith may be much greater in a person, (as in one illiterate and unexperienced) where the rational or provable assurance of this Faith is much less. And of this, that this adherence to a truth as Gods Word may far transcend the external discurssive evidence one may have thereof, I think, none doubt. See *Chillingworth* himself conceding it p. 37.

5ly. That Protestants also grant the certainty of these Motives, or this Tradition, to be an abundantly sufficient certainty for a rational-ground of Faith Divine, which still relates to a matter of fact that is past; and do alledge it either for the only, or for the chief, ground of their believing the main Article of their Divine

§. 146.

Faith, on which they ground the rest; *Viz.* That the Scriptures are Gods Word. So that all the dispute between the two Churches about the certainty of several points of Faith, is not; Whether that this Tradition its delivering such a thing be a sufficient evidence of its truth; But *1st.* What, or how many things this sufficiently self-evident Tradition *de facto* hath delivered? *2dly.* Whether, supposing a sufficiently self-evident Tradition of some Articles of our Faith, Yet Church Infallibility, as divinely assisted, be not still necessary for those many other Articles of Faith, of which there is not so clear and express a Tradition, I mean, written, or unwritten; and necessary also for those Articles that have a clear Tradition, for assuring the certainty of the Faith of the most of Christians; who are not so fitly qualified to examine Tradition; nor so well acquainted with what it delivers?

§. 147.
To a.

This premised. Out of it To a. The former part of the Objection, the force of which lies in these two Propositions. (opposing the repairing of Catholicks, in their Resolution of a Divine Faith, in the last place to Tradition and the Motives for avoyding a Circle): 1. That a Divine Faith cannot ultimately be built upon or resolved into. (now a Divine, but) Humane Authority; 2. That a non-possibly fallible Divine Faith cannot be grounded on Tradition or the Motives only highly probable, or morally certain; I answer, as to the first proposition; That a Divine Faith may ultimately resolve it self into Humane Authority as into the Rational evidence or proof of its Object, but never as into its Formal object, and that on which it relies as to its chief confidence therein, and adherence thereto.

To the 2d. That a Divine Faith is not affirmed on the behalf of the Subject or Believer to be non-possibly fallible, as to the rational proof or evidence whereon it relies, any further, than that of the foresaid Tradition may be stiled for; as to its chief confidence therein, and adherence thereto.

§. 148.
To b.

To b. Urging, that the Resolution of a Divine Faith always into Divine Revelation must, for the avoiding of a Circle, at last rest in some one, for the confirmation of which it can produce no other, and so must believe such Divine Revelation without having any ground at all that it is so, which makes an arbitrary Faith. I answer, *1st.* That, since Protestants pretend to such a Divine Faith as well as Catholicks, and say also, that this must still ground it self on Divine Revelation; and so since some ultimate Divine Revelation they also must have, on which this Faith must finally rest; They also, as much as Catholicks, are concerned in an Answer. Next I say, that a Divine Faith always hath a rational ground, *viz.* Tradition, for its believing such ultimate

timate Revelation Divine. But yet that such Tradition is never the formal Object of such a Faith.

The same Answer may be applied to D. *Nothing more*, arguments that follow.

To his words, *If it be, then a Divine Faith may be built on Prudential Advertisers.* Answer, So it may, as to its Proof; but never, as to its Object.

To S. *How I hope, you deny, not but the Scriptures and the Church's Infallibility are both to be believed with the same kind of assent.*

Yes, they are, both as this aspect of a Divine Faith, in both, relates to an infallible object, and, as to both of them, relies on the same ultimate Proof or Evidence, *viz.* Tradition; But the immediate proof or ground of believing one Divine Revelation, sometimes, may be another; though this never affords any greater Evidence to such Revelation, than it self hath.

To A. *I then ask, Why with a Divine Faith you believe the Church's Infallibility?* I answer; Supposing here, you ask, Why, *z. e.* Upon what ground reason or motive I believe Church-Infalibility to be a Divine Revelation, that I believe it from Tradition, so and so circumstantiated, which conveys it to me for such. For, though some Divine Revelations are, yet all need not to be, grounded on some other Divine Revelation for the Reason, we have of believing them such.

To Z. *Or else deny it to be necessary, that every Article of Faith must be built on Divine Authority.* Answer, If you mean, as to its Proof, so we do; and so must all men, that will not make a probation of, and by, Divine Revelations *in infinitum*; Nor on the other side will not profess, that they have no ground or reason at all why they believe the first.

By these short Replies I think you may perceive a Divine Faith sufficiently grounded, and yet any vicious Circle clearly avoided. For, (to make some Instances here for more perspicuity's sake) suppose, a Protestant ask at large, without inserting with a Divine Faith, Why I believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God? It is answered, Because the Church, which is infallible, tells me they are so. If asked again, Why I believe the Church infallible? I answer; Because Tradition qualified with the Motives, and thus of it self sufficiently evident, tells me it is so; or, conveys this to me as an Apostolical Doctrine or Tradition. Or again, in another order of learning my Faith, if a Protestant asks, Why I believe the Church to be infallible? It is answered, Because the Scriptures, which are the word of God, tell me so, (for, as hath been often said, the Articles of every ones Faith need not have the

§. 149.

To Y.

To S.

To A.

To Z.

§. 150.

same.

same order in our coming to the knowledge of them. If asked again, why I believe Scriptures Gods Word, or such a sense of them, the true Answer, that I learn these from the forementioned Tradition. [For, not only some one, but several Articles of Faith are witnessed by a sufficiently clear Tradition; and either of these forenamed, being first evidenced to me by Tradition, may prove the other without any vicious Circle.] So again, If be asked, Why I believe Infant-Baptisme, as to the lawfulness thereof, to be Divine Revelation? I answer here (waving whether the Scriptures have clearly delivered it) Because Apostolical Tradition hath delivered it such; and then I prove it Apostolical Tradition from an unanimous Consent of Posterity delivering it as such. And in all there is not the least appearance of a Circle.

But, If asked the former Questions adding the word Divine to my Faith, here my Resolution of it, as to the Object on which such Faith ultimately rests as Divine, must terminate sooner. So, for Example, Asked, Why with a Divine Faith I believe the Scriptures to be Gods Word? I answer, as before, from the infallibility of the Church testifying them to be so. Again, asked, Why, from what other Divine Proof or testimony, I believe the Church's Infallibility? I answer, from none; and That the Resolution of my Divine Faith, as to its Object, or as it in respect of its object is termed Divine, can proceed no further. But, if asked, Why, .i.e. whether upon any rational sufficient proof or ground I believe the infallibility of the Church as divinely revealed? I answer, yes I do, from Tradition, and the Motives conveying such a Divine Revelation to me. But the Veracity of this Tradition I do not believe with a Divine Faith, as being no Divine Testimony. If it be said here further; That this Tradition can give me no, not, possibly, fallible assurance or proof that such is a Divine Revelation. I answer. Neither doth a Divine Faith require any exceeding that, which (whatever it be) such Tradition affords; nor indeed, as to all persons, so much; as hath been shewed.

The generall order of a Christian's Belief then seems to be this, I. The Divine Revelations are communicated to the world by certain Persons chosen by God; and, for the confirmation of their Mission from him, doing Miracles; which persons also are commanded by God to ordain others to divulge and perpetuate the knowledge of the same Revelations to mankind to the end of the world, the chief Body of which Revelations these Persons draw up and deliver in writing. Of which Divine Revelations, delivered by them by word and writing this is one: That these their Successors shall for ever be so far assisted by Gods Holy Spirit, as never

to err in teaching all truths (or, if you will, in truly relating all Divine Revelations) any way necessary to mens salvations; which Divine Revelation also concerning themselves is (as it ought to be) delivered among the rest, to all posterity, by these very Successors, of whom it is spoken. These Divine Revelations thus conveyed, the People of any Age, to whom they are communicated both by these the Apostles successors, and other faithful, first applying themselves to the Relaters give credit to these Persons, being such a multitude in several Nations so unanimous and consenting in what they deliver, rendered also most credible by all those other prudential Motives, mentioned before, their Sanctity, their Miracles, their suffering for the truth of what they deliver, &c. But Their crediting of these Persons is as yet but an humane faith yielded to, and relying on, a humane testimony. But then, applying themselves to the things related, which are said to have been revealed and delivered first by God to persons assisted with most infallible Miracles, they come to believe (I do not say, know) these things related, after the manner expressed before §. 125. n. 1. with yet an higher, and a Divine Faith, introduced in them by the Holy Spirit, and resting it self not on the veracity of these secondary Relaters, but, on the veracity of God himself, from whom these Revelations are said originally to come; whilst yet the rational Introduction to all this Faith is only the veracity of those who immediately convey the Tradition of these things to them. Then further, One of the Divine Revelations delivered by this Tradition, as was said, being this, that these Successors of the Apostles who convey these doctrines to us shall be for ever infallible in delivering all necessities; here Christians believe also the Infallibility of the Church, or of these Successors not with a rational or humane faith only, relying on an humane, but with a Divine Faith, relying on the Divine Testimony.

So this Infallibility of the Church, thus believed with a Divine Faith as a Divine Revelation, is a main ground and pillar of the Catholics faith for any other Articles thereof that are established by the same Church's definitions, where the Scriptures or Tradition Apostolick, or what Posterity hath delivered for such, are to him (but, I say not, to the Church) doubtful. Of which ground and assurance of such points (believed by Catholics from the Church's infallible authority) the Protestants Faith is destitute.

And thus the faith of all such Articles grounded thus on the Church's infallible authority, is, by this, grounded also on Divine Revelation. And, had the New Testament Scriptures not been writ (as they might have been not written without infallibility,

ing,

ing the Christian Religion) then all the Resolution of the Articles of our Faith would have been only into the unwritten Testimony of the Apostles. And by this (though without any testimony of Scripture) must such Promises concerning a perpetual Divine Assistance as to necessities made to the Church before these Scriptures were written, have been delivered, and so conveyed to Posterity by Tradition: and the same evidence also in this matter must have been given to this unwritten Tradition Apostolical thus conveyed and testified, as is now given also to the Scriptures. But blessed be his Divine Majesty so so firmly establishing Christianity not on one, but both these two sure Bases, the Scriptures, and the Church. For, both are Pillars of Truth: and both always bear witness to the Truth, so also to one another. And what Thou hast enjoyed, O Lord, let no man be able to separate; nor the Gates of Hell ever so prevail against them, as that any should prosper in their endeavours to build the Authority of the One out of the ruins of the Other: Amen.

† 1 Tim. 3.
15.

§. 154.
The Conclusion.

This much be said concerning the necessary Resolution of a Catholic's Faith; and in satisfaction to those other objections, that are urged against *living Ecclesiastical infallible Guide in all necessities*; maintained in the former Discourses, and affirmed also easily discernable from all other Pretenders.

After all which, in the last place, the Protestant Reader is humbly desired to consider with himself: Whether, if indeed there be such a *Catholic infallible Guide* as is here pretended; and *that Church* also, whose conduct he hath renounced, be it, which our Lord hath left, amidst the distractions of so many Sects and Opinions, to bring men by a sure way to Heaven; whether, I say, notwithstanding all those reasons and arguments, that have been here, and are elsewhere, by Catholics frequently urged in demonstration thereof, yet his ignorance of it still remains so innocent, and invincible, that he dares rely on this Plea, at the appearance of our Lord, for his living and dying irreconciled unto Her, because no sufficient evidence hath been left him to discern Her, not so. And next, to consider, Whether, if indeed she be, what here she is pretended, there can be any secular interest so valuable, as any way to recompence the loss he sustains, in his present separation from this Church, by foregoing all those means of salvation, and growth in grace, and advantages of an holy life, which he might, with great spiritual content, enjoy in her happy bosom? Of which advantages, because they are, by some of those departed from this Church so well weighed as they

ought,

ought, for a conclusion of the whole, I beg leave (not to stay only in universals, but) to represent some particulars, to the begetting in such (by the aid of the Divine Grace), an holy emulation, and longing, for the re-fruition of them, and a greater resentment of their present impediments, and defects.

Let such a one then, in the name and fear of God, consider the great benefit, as to the working of his salvation, which he might happily enjoy in this Church, by these particulars following. * By her daily-celebrated Sacrifice of the *Altar*, and the so often renewed corporal presence of our Lord in the holy *Eucharist*, and the most acceptable opportunity of the presentation of his requests, and opening of his necessities at this time—*Quando in manibus est hostia*, (to use S. Chrysostom's words †) *adsumt Angeli, adsumt Archangeli, adest Filius Dei—Dum mors illa perficitur, & hoc* *rendum Sacrificium, & ineffabilia Sacramenta* [&] *quasi, sedente Rege, quacunq[ue] quis vulnerit, perficit.* * By the Communion and suffrages of the *Saints*, (here) so honourably commemorated, and their intercessions so frequently implored. * By the frequent examining, and purging of his conscience by *Sacramental Confession*, and the prudent advices of his *Ghostly Father*, and a frequent participation of the *holy Communion*; the use whereof, with many more devoutly pious Sons of the Church, is almost quotidian. §. 155.

* By those many excellent *Rules*, and other means, which this Church, in a singular and transcendent manner to any other Christian Society, prescribes to, and provides for, him, for eradicating former habits of sin; getting the mastery of his own will, and passions; mortifying carnal lusts, and worldly ambition; acquiring, and, preserving Christian virtues; and attaining perfection. Rom. 21.

Such as are, * Her special recommendation, of frequent, and long *Fasts*; of *Abstinences* from pleasant food; of *Retirement*, *Cloisters*, and *Solitude*; of *Celibacy* (to the persons well prepared to receive it; as all may be, if they will), *ut sint sine solitudine*, 1 Cor. 7. 32; of voluntary *Poverty* (I mean the possession only of a necessary livelihood); and of a resigned *Obedience* (I mean in all lawful things only) to the will of a discreet *Superior*.

* Her recommending so highly corporal *Mortifications*, as most profitable for the cure of all diseases of the soul, and for planting in it true humility, and self-denial; such as are, *mean fare, hard lodging, coarse apparel, hair-cloth, disciplines, watchings, &c.* And her enjoying the abstinence from many things lawful, for preventing of actions unlawful.

* Her accurate studying the diseases of the Soul, and weighing the several degrees, and malignities,

malignties of *sins*, carefully severing those which give mortal wounds from those that bring slighter hurts; and prescribing to her Penitents great diversity of medicinal penances; as one, or other, may more conduce to the removal of them, and to the producing a future compleat Reformation.

* Her excellent directions in *mystical Theology*, and the practice of *mental and vocal Prayer* for attaining Recollection, and a closer union with God; and her most prudent conduct of the illiterate, (who have but few prayers by heart, and are not able to help themselves by Books,) in a frequent repetition of these prayers to several particular pious intentions, and especially to this, their frequent calling to mind the several *mysteries* of our *Redemption*, so to continue these persons, also, in a constant devotion.

* Her diligent prescribing choice Subjects, and Heads, and ways of *Meditation*; and amongst these, especially, those of the poor, and humble Life, the great and silent Sufferings, and the painful, and patient Death, of our *blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, proposed as a perfect Pattern of inheriting future glory by present humility, and sufferings; to which all men as much as may be, ought to conform: And next; the reading of the holy *Lives* of his *Saints*; in which she abounds, and furnisheth her Subjects, incomparably beyond any other Christian Society. * The high value she sets upon, and necessity she urgeth, of an inherent *Sanctity*; of the practice of Christian *virtues*; and of *good works*; especially those of *Almsdeeds*, mercy, and charity to our neighbour, (in so much that some of her adversaries say, but untruly, that she entrusts salvation more upon our own merits, than our Lord's): of which works her publick Benefactions shew great variety, beyond any other Sects, extending to all the wants of humane life; she instituting also several *Societies*, or *Fraternities*, who relieve with their charities, or instruct and comfort with their learning and advice; or fortify with the Sacraments, or tend with their persons, those, who seem the greatest spectacles of misery, and objects of pity.

* Her zealous vindicating the powerful effect of our Lord's *Redemption* as to our freedom from the former bondage of *sin*, and the ability, which the Grace of the Holy Ghost, (purchased by him,) confers on all the regenerate, to walk henceforth in all the Commandements of God blameless, as to mortal sin. And her much pressing the infinite variety, and *degrees*, of the future celestial reward, promised by the Divine bounty, one much greater and higher than another, and all distributed according to the *degrees* of Christian perfection here; where no extraordinary service loseth its just wages, and who sows plentifully, so reaps:

thereby

thereby encouraging her Sons to undertake difficult matters for the service of his Divine Majesty, and to attempt the observance of the highest Rules of perfection; and imitation of the greatest Saints. And her prescribing many useful lessons, and Documents for the attaining, and preserving of all *Christian virtues*; which, with the several mysteries of our Redemption, are the chief Subject of her publick Discourses; wherein she endeavours to render her Sons, not only purged from sin, but perfect in love. ¹ Her most careful assistance of all her children at their last hour, with the help of her *Sacraments*; cleansing them with *Confession*; and exciting acts of Contrition; arming them with the sacred *Viaticum*, and other Sacraments; and then, following them with her *Prayers*, and *Oblations* into the next world; that thus they may, in all manners, participate the benefits of the Communion of Saints. ² Her great care to preserve an holy *Clergy*; enjoying them *Celibacy*; the more to free them from secular encumbrances; *Ut non sine dispendio Dominum obsecrent sine impedimento* †; and a daily long *Divine Service*, ordinarily indispenfable, distributed into several *hours*, to keep them as it were in a continual colloquy with God, and paying him, for mankind, a daily tribute of Praise; enjoying also, with a strict fast to be observed till such action be performed, a frequent (i. e. at least on all Sundays, and solemn Festivals;) Oblation of the Evangelical *Sacrifice*; and participation of the holy *Communion*, (prepared so often also for any others, that hunger after this daily Bread;) things, which it were a great crime for such persons to do, when living in any mortal sin. ³ And her linking them also together by a most regular *subordination*, and strict *obedience*, to retain them unanimous in all things she prescribes; and so to derive upon them, and her self, the blessings of unity, and peace. ⁴ Her prudent *distribution*, ⁵ of the *Ciracle* of the *Year*; in her publick Liturgy, as it were into a continual meditation of the chief Mysteries of our Redemption, lengthning the more solemn *Festivals* thereof with *Offices*, &c. furnishing them with a Service closely applied to the season, and adorned with *Lectures* out of the *Psalms*, *Hymns*, *Antiphons*, *Responsories*, proper to the solemnity (which great Festivals are, elsewhere, ordinarily passed over only with Scripture *Lectures*, and a short *Collect*, and the service of one single day.) ⁶ Next, for a more worthy preparation to the receipt of those Graces, which our Lord in the *fore said* mysteries hath procured for us, ⁷ Her assigning another part of this year for a time of *Humiliation*, and *Confession* (as the holy time of *Advent*, and of *Lent*) fitted with a constant service suitable to the Exercise, in those times, of a godly sorrow, and *Contrition*;

† 1 Cor. 7.
33, 35.

Those of her Sons, who are lovers of piety, thus spending some part of this Ecclesiastical year in a spiritual joy, Hymns, Prayers, and Thanksgivings: another, in Litanies, Fastings, Tears, and sundry penitential devotions. *§. 157.* Her receiving several Books of Scripture as Canonical and Divine, and so requiring of all her Sons a suitable observance and obedience therto, which others degrade, extenuate, and reject: And, whilst they pretend the holy Bible their only Rule of Faith, yet are the persons also, who most abridge it. * Her studying likewise all the wayes how to preserve these *Divine Oracles* in a most sacred reverence and esteem; and unviolated by the private, and undigested interpretations and glosses of the vulgar and unlearned; the true sense of which, together with the letter, she takes care, that they should receive from the mouths of their spiritual *Pastors* and *Teachers*, so to keep the most infirm steady in an Orthodox faith. * Her entertaining also & vindicating several writings of the *Fathers* as Genuine, and *Councils* as obligatory, whereby the doctrine both of Christian Faith, and manners, is much fortified and promoted; of which writings and decrees, others, whilst they question the Authority, lose the Benefit. *§. 158.* Her many external expressions of honour, and reverence to all things, which any way more nearly relate to God, & his *Saints*; partly, to elevate mens devotions to them; partly, to excite the memory, and imitation of them; whilst others, not knowing these natural effects of this divine love, stile such her affection, superstition. *§. 159.* The holy *Example*, shining before others, of many of both sexes within her Communion, treading under their feet all secular pleasures, contents, and ambitions; and shewing the highest precepts, and Councils of our Lord and of his Church practicable: especially those examples of several *Religious Orders* (living under various Rules of a singular devotion, fitted for all sorts, and conditions, and drawn up by persons endued with a divine prudence, joyned with a long experience): By whose eminent sanctity, conspicuous to all, is sufficiently removed any prejudice to the holy Doctrine, and Discipline of this Church, raised from the vicious lives of some others, the undutiful Sons of a most pious Mother. *§. 160.* If then, I say, all these advantages of attaining salvation, and of increase of grace, are found to be, in such a singular manner, promoted in this Church as not in any other, so that, as the only pretends to be the infallible Guide, so she only seems worthy to be so, let him consider what precious helps he loseth, in not rendring himself (perhaps, for some trifling, secular respects) in all things her obedient Disciple. And, in the midst of such resigned thoughts,

may

may the good Lord, the only *Teacher of hearts*, so open his, that, amongst the many paths, by several Sects, with equal zeal, proposed, he may make an happy choice of that, which may most surely conduct him to eternal happiness, and be most acceptable to the Divine Majesty : To whose Patronage and Benediction the Author humbly commits his proficiency and these his labours for advancing it ; who, in the midst of them, often considered—*That none can do any thing against the Truth, but for the Truth* † And—*That whatever Counsel or work is not of God, shall* † 2 Cor. 13. 8 *come to nought* *—*That a Woe is to all those that call good evil, and* * Act. 5. 38. *evil good* † And—*He accursed, that makes the blind to wander out* † Isa. 5. 20. *of the way* * ; and therefore assureth his pious Reader, that he * Deut. 27. would not, wittingly, have taken this pains, only to inherit to 18, himself the malediction due to a Seducer, and to become answerable to God for the loss of another's Soul ; or, for any other end, save that, of advancing God's glory, in his eternal Felicity. And if any shall hereafter designe a confutation of these Discourses, he also is desired first to take into his thoughts the same Meditations : lest perhaps learning, or wit, or some secular interest, should prevail with him, either to write those things to perswade others, which do not perswade himself ; or, to believe and perswade himself those things, which he might discern to oppose an apparent Truth, if he were divested of some inordinate passions and prejudices clouding his judgment. For, we may presume, from such an heavy curse laid on false Guides, that, though an utterly irresistible evidence of Truth, in Divine matters, must not be expected, which would lessen the merit of our Faith ; yet so sufficient a manifestation thereof is left us by our good Lord, as will render the learned, when opposing it, unexcused. To which Lord, the Fountain of all Truth, and faithful Protector of his Church, be all Honour, and Glory for ever. *Amen.*

THE
FOURTH DISCOURSE.

Containing the SOCINIAN'S Apology
for the believing, and teaching, his Doctrine,
against former Church-Definitions, and pre-
sent Church-Authority, upon the Protestant's
Grounds.

Divided into FIVE CONFERENCES.

The First CONFERENCE.

The Socinian's Protestant-Plea for his not holding any thing con-
trary to the *Holy Scriptures*.

1. **T**hat he believes all contained in the *Scriptures* to be God's Word; and therefore implicitly believes those truths, against which he errs. §. 2.
2. That, also, he useth his best endeavour to finde the true sense of *Scriptures*: and, that more is not required of him from God for his faith or salvation, than doing his best endeavour for attaining it. §. 3.
3. That, as for an explicate faith required of some points necessary; he is sufficiently assured; that this point concerning the Son's Consubstantiality with the Father, as to the affirmative, is not so from the Protestant's affirming all necessities to be clear in *Scriptures*, even to the unlearned; which this, in the affirmative, is not to him. §. 4.
4. That several express, and plain *Scriptures* do persuade him, that the negative (if either) is necessary to be believed; and that from the clearness of *Scriptures*, he hath as much certainty in this point, as Protestants can have, from them, in some other, held against the common expressions of the former times of the Church. §. 5. & 8.
5. That, for the right understanding of *Scriptures*, either he may be certain of a just industry used; or else, that Protestants, in asserting that

that the Scriptures are plain only to the industrious; and then, that none are certain, when they have used a just industry, thus must still remain also uncertain in their faith; as not knowing, whether some defect in this their industry causeth them not to mistake the Scriptures.

6. Lastly; That none have used more diligence in the search of Scripture, than the Socinians; as appears by their writings, addicting themselves wholly to this Word of God, and not suffering themselves to be any way byass'd by any other humane, either modern, or ancient, Authority. §. 9.

Digress. { Where, The Protestant's, and Socinian's pretended Certainty of the sense of Scripture apprehended by them, and made the ground of their faith against the sense of the same Scripture declared by the major part of the Church, is examined. §. 9.

§. 1.

THAT those things, which have been delivered in the three former Discourses, concerning the invalidity of the Protestants Guide for preserving the true faith, and suppressing Heresies, may be clearer seen, and more seriously considered; I have thought fit in this (for an Example) to shew what Apology a Socinian, upon the forementioned Protestant-positions, may return for himself to a Protestant endeavouring to reduce him to the true Faith, and using any of these five motives thereto; the Testimony ^{1.} Of Scriptures; ^{2.} Of Catholick Church; ^{3.} Of her Councils; ^{4.} The danger of Heresie; ^{5.} The danger of Schism.

In which I would not be thought to go about, to equal all other Protestant-opinions to the malignity of the Socinian errors: but only to shew, that several defences, which, in respect of the former motives, Protestants use for retaining theirs, if these are thought just and reasonable, the Socinians may use the same for much grosser, Tenents.

For, suppose a Protestant, first, concerning the Scriptures, question a Socinian in this manner.

Prot. Why do you, to the great danger of your soul, and salvation, not believe, *God the Son to be of one, and the same essence, and substance with God the Father*, it being so principal an Article of the Christian faith, delivered in the Holy Scriptures?

Soc. To give you a satisfactory account of this matter.

I do believe, with other Christians, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; and, with other Protestants, that they are a perfect Rule of my faith,

§. 2.

Prot. But, this secures you not, unless you believe according

ding to this Rule ; which in this point, you do not. *See.*

However, I believe in this point, truly, or falsely ; I am secure that my faith is entire, as to all necessary points of faith. *Prot. How*

So? *Soc.* Because, as M. Chillingworth saith † — He that believeth p. 23, 159, *believes all that is in the Bible, all that is in the Scriptures (as I do) believeth all that is necessary there.* 367.

Pr. This must needs be true : but meanwhile, if there be either some part of Scripture not known at all by you ; or the true sense of some part of that you know (for, the Scripture, as that Author notes †, is not so much the words, as the sense) be mistaken by you, how can you say, you believe all the Scriptures ? For, when you say, you believe all the Scripture, you mean only this : that you believe, that, whatsoever is the true sense thereof, that is God's Word ; and most certainly true : which belief of yours doth very well consist with your not believing, or also your believing the contrary to, the true sense thereof : and then you, not believing the true sense of some part of it at least, may also not believe the true sense of something necessary there ; which is quite contrary to your conclusion here.

Soc. † — I believe that that sense of them which God intendeth whosoever is in, is certainly true ; And thus I believe implicitly even † *Chill. p. 18.* those very truths, against which I err. Next : † — I do my best en- † *Chill. lb.*

deavour to believe Scripture in the true sense thereof. [By my best endeavour I mean †, such a measure of industry, as humane prudence, and † *Chill. p. 19.*

ordinary discretion (my abilities and opportunities, my distractions, and hindrances, and all other things considered) shall advise me unto, in a manner of such consequence. Of using which endeavour also, I conceive,

I may be sufficiently certain ; [for otherwise, I can have no certainty of any thing I believe from this compleat Rule of Scrip- tures,

this due endeavour being the condition, which Protestants require, that I shall not be, as to all necessities, deceived in the sense of Scripture.] Now, being conscious to my self of such a

right endeavour used, † — For me, to believe, further, this or that, to † *Chillingw.* be the true sense of some Scriptures ; or to believe the true sense of them, p. 102.

and to avoid the false, is not necessary, either to my faith, or salvation.

Apr. If God would have had his meaning in these places certainly known, how could it stand with his wisdom, to be sawaring to his own will, and end as to such absurdely ? Or how can it consist with his justice, to

quize of men to know certainly the meaning of those words which he him- self hath not revealed ? † — For my error or ignorance in what is not † *Chill. p. 18.*

plainly contained in Scripture, after my best endeavour used, to say that 92.

God will damn me for such errors, who am a lover of him, and lover of truth, is to rob man of his comfort, and God of his goodness ; is to make

man desperate; and God tyrant.

§. 4.

Pror. But this defence will no way serve your turn for all points of faith revealed in Scripture: for you ought to have of some points an *express* and *explicite* faith. Soc. Of what points?

Pror. Of all those that are *fundamental* and *necessary*.

Soc. Then if this point of *Consubstantiality* of the Son with God the Father be none of the *Fundamentals*, and *necessaries*, wherein I am to have a right and an *explicite* faith, the account I have given you already, I hope, is satisfactory.

§. 5.

† Chill. p. 92.

But next: I am secure, that this point, which is the subject of our discourse, at least in the affirmative thereof, is not *fundamental*; for, according to the Protestant principles *—The Scripture is a Rule, as sufficiently perfect, so sufficiently intelligible in things necessary, to all that have understanding; whether learned, or unlearned. Neither is anything necessary to be believed, but what is plainly revealed: for to say, that when a place of Scripture by reason of ambiguous terms lies indifferent between divers senses, whereof one is true, and the other false, that God obligeth men under pain of damnation not to mistake through error, and humane frailty, is to make God a tyrant and to say that he requires of us certainty to attain that*

† Chill. p. 99.

and for the attaining whereof, we have no certain means: In fine, where Scriptures are plain, as they are in necessities, they need no infallible Interpreter. no further explanation [to me]; and where they are not plain, there if I, using diligence to find the truth, do yet miss of it, and fall into error, there is no danger in it. Pror. True.

Such necessary points are clear to the unlearned, using a due Industry, void of a contrary interest, &c.

Soc. And in such industry I may be assured, I have not been deficient: having bestowed much study on this matter, read the controversy on both sides; compared Texts, &c. (as also appears in the diligent writings of others of my persuasion); and after all this, the sense of Scripture also, which I embrace, (a sense, you know, decried and persecuted by most Christians) is very contrary to all my secular relations, interest, and profit.

§. 6.

Now, after all this search I have used, I am so far satisfied, that this point, on the affirmative side, is not clear, and evident in Scripture (and therefore no *Fundamental*, that I can produce most clear, and evident places out of the Scriptures (if a man can be certain of any thing from the perspicuity of its expressions) that the contrary of it is so.

[See *Crestinus* in the preface to his book *De uno Deo Patre — Hæc de uno Deo Patre sententia plurimis, ac clarissimis sacrarum literarum testimoniis nititur — Evidens sententia veritas, & rationum firmis.*

firmissimarum & sacris literis sponte subnascentium multitudo, ingenii nostri tenuitatem subleuat, &c. --- Argumenta, quæ ex sacris literis deprompsimus, per se plana sunt, ac facilia adeo quidem, ut eorum vim declinare aliâ ratione non possint adversarii, quam ut à verborum simplicitate tum ipsi defleant, tum nos abducere contentur. And see the particular places of Scripture which they urge (where, as to the expression, & other texts being laid aside, that seems to be said, as it were *veridem verbis*, which the Socinians maintain). *Job. 14. 28. 17. 3. Ep. 1 Cor. 8. 6. — Col. 1. 15. & Rev. 3. 14.* I set not down this, to countenance their cause, but to shew their confidence.

Præ. O strange presumption! And is not your judgment, then, liable to mistake in the true sense of these Scriptures, because you strongly perswade your self, they are most evident on your side?

Soc. Tis true, that I may mistake in the sense of some Scripture; but it follows not from hence, that I can be certain of the sense of no Scriptures. To answer you in the words of Mr.

Chillingworth † — Though I pretend not to certain means in interpreting all Scripture, particularly such places, as are obscure, and ambiguous, yet this methinks should be no impediment, but that we may have certain means of not erring in, and about the sense of those places which are so plain, and clear, that they need no Interpreters; and in such this my faith is contained. If you ask me, how I can be sure, that I know the true meaning of these places? I ask you again; can you be sure, you understand, what I, or any man else saith? They, that heard our Saviour and the Apostles preach can they have sufficient assurance, that they understood at any time, what they would have them do? If not, so what end did they hear them? If they could; why may not I be as well assured, that I understand sufficiently, what I conceive plain in their writings?

Again; I pray tell me whether do you certainly know the sense of these Scriptures, for the evidence of which you separated from the Church that was before *Luther*, requiring conformity to the contrary doctrines, as a condition of her Communion? If you do, then give us leave to have the same means, and the same abilities to know other plain places, which you have to know these. For if all Scripture be obscure, how can you know the sense of these places? if some places of it be plain, why should I stay here? If you ask, seeing I may possibly err, how can I be assured, I do not? I ask you again; seeing your eyesight may deceive you, how can you be sure, you see the Sun, when you do see it? A Judge may possibly err in judgment, can he therefore never have assurance, that he hath judged rightly? A Traveller may possibly mistake his way; must I therefore be doubtful, whether I am in the right way from my Hall to my Chamber? Or can our London Carrier have no certainty in the middle of the day, when he

§. 7.

p. III.

† Id. p. 112.

† Ib. p. 117.

† Id. p. 112. is sober, and in his wits, that he is in his way to London? — † This I am certain of, that God will not require of me a certainly unerring belief, unless he hath given me a certain means to avoid error; and if I use those, which I have, will never require of me, that I use that which I have not — This is Mr. *Chillingworth's* solid plea against the Papist's grand objection, for the proving an uncertainty in the Protestant's faith upon any their pretence of evident Scripture.

† See also
Chill. p. 140,
366, 367.

§. 8.

Prot. But the Scriptures, which you urge against the Son's being the same one only God with God the Father, carry not the same evidence, and clearness, as those Scriptures do, whereon Protestants build the certainty of their faith against the Papists, or against the common Church-doctrines that were before Luther.

Soc. That say the Papists of your plain Scriptures, which you of mine: I pray, what can be said, more plain, or in what point, in your opinion; more fundamental (wherein we contend Scripture is most clear, even to the unlearned); than this, in *Joh. 17. 3.* — *Ut cognoscant te [Pater] solum verum Deum; & quem misisti, Jesum Christum* — And, *1 Cor. 8. 6. Unus Deus, Pater; & unus Dominus, Jesus.* And, *Eph. 4. ver. 5. Unus est Dominus, [i. e. Jesus;]* and then ver. 6. *Unus est Deus, & Pater omnium* — And *Joh. 14. 1. Creditis in Deum, & in me credite* — And ver. 28. *Pater meus major me est*: I say, what more clear for proving the Father his being the true, most high, God, and excluding the other persons [the Son, or the holy Ghost] from being the very same God?

Prot. And what more clear, on the other side, than these Texts, *Rom. 9. 5. Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is, over all, God blessed for ever* — And, *Tit. 2. 13. The glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour, Jesus Christ.* And † — we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life, spoken by S. John, the great victor, against *Simon, Cerinthus, Carpocrates*, and others in his time, opposers, of our Lord's Divinity — And *Apos. 1. 8. compared with 1. 17.* — *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come; the Almighty* — I say, what more clear than these Texts, for shewing the true Divinity of Christ?

† S. Hieron.
de viris il-
lust.

And then, how many other clear Texts are there, asserting the Eternity of our Lord; that he is nothing made or created, but pre-existent before the constitution of the world, equal with God; & that heaven, and earth and all things were made by him, that were made; and that he descended from heaven from his Father, when he took our nature upon him? See *Joh. 1. 1. &c.* — *3. 13.* *Heb. 1. 2, 3, 10. &c.* — *Joh. 1. 5, 24.* — *Phil. 2. 6.* — *Joh. 6. 38* — *1. 28* — *1 Tim. 3. 16.* — *Heb. 2. 14.* And then, his *Divinity* thus cleared;

his

his Deity can be no other, than by the total essence his of, pure, rightly the same with that of God the Father. For those of your own Sect, together with the whole Christian world, do acknowledge, That there is but one numerical most high God, an inseparable attribute of whom is his Creating of the world, and pre-existence before it. And again, That the substance, or essence of this most high God, is not any way divisible, partible, or multipliable; so that, *Scilicet Christus ex Dei substantia generatus sit, et in Patris substantia, eadem numero, communicatus sit.* See *Volkel de vera Rel.* l. 5. c. 12. upon which consequence well discerned, your predecessors were constrained to desert Arianism, or semi-Arianism, and to take in other respects a more desperate way, of denying any pre-existence of our Lord before his incarnation. To return, then, to our business. All Scripture being equally true, you know, no Text thereof can be pronounced clear in such a sense, which others, as clear, contradict. The non-consideration of which, by the passionate or unlearned, is the mother of all errors. The Texts therefore that you produce here, so manifest on your side, that they are not contradictory many more others as clear against you, are to be understood to speak of our Lord only according to his Incarnation, *Infant* and *Mediant* ship, in which he hath an inferiority to the Father and is our Lord, by a special Redemption with his blood, in another manner, than He together with his Father, in the same sense, is the one true God. See. All the Texts you have mentioned have been diligently considered and answered, by our party. And your Answer is being forced, absurd, as may clearly appear to any rational and indifferent person perusing *Volkelius* l. 5. from the 10. to the 14. Chapter. But to omit this dispute, as now beside my purpose. If your sense of the Scriptures you have urged be so manifest and clear, as you pretend, how comes so great a part of the Christian world (double so rational men) in the sense of the several Scriptures so much to differ from you? Therefore here I cannot but still suppose in you the defect of a *due industria*, well comparing these Scriptures, and void of pride, passion, and other interest. See. And I return the like question to you, if, on the clearness of the express sense of these Scriptures, beamer infallibly ground my faith, against many other rational men contradicting; on what plainness of the sense of any other Scripture is it, that Protestants can ground theirs, against a contrary sense given by the learned; by several Councils; by the whole Church of some ages; as they do; not promising to the Conscience, even to the four furs, an absolute, but conditional assent. Only so far, as their Doctrines agree with these clear Scriptures.

reſes? If either the plain words of Scripture can afford a ſufficient certainty to me in this matter; which Scriptures, you ſay, in fundamentals are to all perſonable (and ſuch do many deem this point); nor I can have a ſufficient advantage of uſing an unbiaſt induſtry in the underſtanding of theſe Scriptures, and alſo in the comparing them with others, in which I am conſcious to my ſelf of noneſteet; I fee no further ground of my preſuming to underſtand any other part of Scripture; and then, wherein can ly the advantage of a Proteſtant's faith, ſo as hee is not eſting in Fundamentals at leaſt? *Benedictus Dominus Deus*; That, when we have become know-
ledge of a thing, we may ſafely deſem from the Schools, viz. *Ubi non est
formalis controversia post aliquam sententiam, et impertinet ibi nec re-
motum per se, debet, unde factis controversiis, ubi se habet ad
alios, non potest, illud esse, quod debet, et debet, et debet.*

* Serm. at
Whitehall,
March 12.
1664. p. 17

† Dr. Ferne
Division of
Churches, p.
46.61-Chil-
lingw. p. 57.
† Stillingfl.
p. I 3.

* Chilingw.
P.59,100.

three times no Protest. † You have no judgment of discretion I grant, and may interpret Scripture for your self: without the use of which judgement you cannot form any solid or reasonable service, who are also to give account of your self, and can be saved by your own faith, and to perish upon your own score. ¹⁰ I dare say that royal prerogative of His Majesty to perform his faithfulness in matters questioned, but leave all to judge according to the standards of the divine laws, because each member of this Society is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that tend thereto. ¹¹ In matters of Religion, when the question is, whether any man be a fit judge, and chooser for himself, we suppose men honest, and such as understand the difference between a malignant, and a healthy, Legid. then I suppose that all the necessary pains in Religion are pains, and easy, in consequence every man in this case to be a competent judge for himself, being so in concern himself to judge aright, as much in eternal happiness as woe: and if through his own default he judge amiss, he alone shall suffer for it: To God's righteous judgment therefore humbly submit you. At your own peril be it. This, of the Society is all concerning the Scripture on his side.

6. 9.

Where the self-cleanness of the sense of Scriptures, not mistakable in Fundamentals, or necessities, upon a due industry used (of which also rightly wise men may be sufficiently assured,) being made the ground, as you see, of the Protestants, and Socinians faith, before these two proceed to any further conference, give me leave to interpose a word between them, concerning this certainty so much spoken of, and presumed on.

§. 10.

And here first, from this way, lately taken by many Protestants, there seems to be something necessarily consequent; which I suppose they will by no means allow; viz. That, instead of the Ro-

man

man Church her setting up some men (the Church Governors) as infallible in necessities, here is set up by their every Christian, if he will, both infallible in all necessities: and certain, that he is so. For the Scripture they affirm most clear in all necessities to all using a due industry; and of this due industry they also affirm, men may be certain, that they have used it; being not all, possible, endeavour, but such a measure thereof as ordinary discretion, &c. *advised to.* (See Mr. Chillingworth, p. 16.) And next, from this affirmed; that, every one may be so certain in all Fundamentals, it must be maintained also, that their spiritual Guides in a conjunction of them, may more; every single Prelate, or Presbyter, if they are not, yet may be, an infallible Guide to the people in all Points necessary. And therefore M. Chillingworth freely speaks to this purpose. — *That these also may be both in Fundamentals, & also in some points unfundamental, both certain of the infallibility of their Rule, and that they do manifestly proceed according to it: and then, in what they are certain that they cannot be mistaken they may (saith he) fully decide the controversies about them, and without rashness propose their decrees, as certain, divine Revelations; and excommunicate or anathematize any man persisting in the contrary error.* And there seems reason in such *Anathemas* because all others either do or may know the truth of the same decrees by the same certain means, as these Governors do. Now then, what certainty the Guides of a particular Church may have, I hope may also those of the Church Catholick; and then, obedience being yielded to these by all their inferiors, this will restore all things to their right course. All this follows upon certainty, That Scriptures are plain in Fundamentals; And that due industry is used to understand them. But, if you should deny, that men can have a *certainty* of their industry rightly used; then again, is all the fair security these men promise their followers of their not erring in necessities, quite vanished.

But now, to pass from this consequence, (to which I know not what can be said), and to enquire a little after the true grounds of our certainty in any thing; which is here so much pretended.

1st. It cannot be denied, that he, that doth err in one thing, may be certain, that he doth not err in some other; because he may have sufficient ground, and means for his not erring in one thing, which he hath not in another. Not again denied, that he, who possibly may err, yet in the same thing may be certain, that he doth not err, if not neglecting some means, which he knows will certainly keep him from error.

2. But notwithstanding these: This seems also necessary to be granted on the other side (& is so by learned Protestants), That,

in what kind of knowledge soever it be (whether of our *Sense*, or *Reason* in whatever *Art*, or *Science*), one can never rightly assure himself concerning his own knowledge, that he is certain of any thing for a truth, which all, or most others, of the same, or better abilities for their cognitive faculties, in all the same external means, on grounds of the knowledge therein, do pronounce an error. Not that truth were not so, though all the world on earth, is not had certain grounds to be proved so, though all the world should deny there; but because the true knowledge of it, and them, cannot possibly appear to one mans intellect; and *omnium paribus*, not to others; Now for any disparity, as to defect, whether in the *instrument* or in the *object* of knowledge, there, where all or most differ from me, it seems a strange trade not to imagine this defect in my self, rather than them; especially, whenas all the grounds of my Science are communicated to them, and whenas, for my own mistakes, I cannot know exactly the extent of supernatural delusions, I say, be this in what knowledge we please, in that of sense, *being, hearing, smelling, or in any*, or Mr. *Chillingworth's* former instances mentioned, §. 7. So, I can never rationally assure myself of what I see, when men, as well or better sighted, and all external circumstances for any thing I know being the same, see no such matter. And this is the Rule also proposed by learned Protestants to keep every Fanatic from pleading certainty in his own Conscience, See Arch-Bp. *Law* (§. 33. Canon 5. n. 1.) and Hooker (*Book 8. c. 6.*) their defining of a clear evidence, or demonstrative argument, viz. *Such is proposed to any man, and understood, th. mind cannot chuse but inwardly assent to it*; and therefore, surely, proposed to many men, the mind of the most cannot dissent from it.

§. 12.

Consequently, in the Scripture, abstracting from the inward operations of God's Holy Spirit, & any external infallible Guide, (which infallible Guide Scripture is self cannot be to women delivering a contrary sense thereof) I see not, from whence any certainty can arise to particular persons, for so many Texts, or places thereof, concerning the sense of which, the most, or the most learned, or their Superiors, to whom also all their motives, or arguments are represented, do differ from them. From the plainness of the expression, or Grammatical construction of the words, such certainty cannot arise; unless no term thereof can possibly be distinguished, or taken in a diverse or unliteral sense; but, if it cannot be so taken, then all Expositors must needs agree in one, and the same sense. For example. For the *literal*, and *Grammatical* sense, what Text plainer than *Hoc est corpus meum* ? and yet Protestants understand it otherwise. Very deficient therefore seem

nor yet, of several expressions in the Ancients, *Justin Martyr*; † See *Peta- Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clements, Alexandrinus, Origen*, that seem to favour our opinion †: Nor, of those Eastern Bishops, which *Arrian*, *ph. Her. 69* in his letter to *Eusebius* *Nicomed.* 11, (numbers on his side); *Hilarinus* || *Apud Epi-* relates, no less than eighty Bishops, before that Council, to have disallowed the reception of the word *eternus*; and, in the Council also, seventeen (some of note) at first to have dissented from the rest. *Theodor.* L. c. 5.

Pror. Not yielding what you say for truth; but, for the present, supposing it; yet the judgment of so small a party may by no means be adhered to by you, it being inconsiderable in respect of the whole Body of the Catholic Church declaring against you.

Soc. If the consent of the such major part is to be taken for the whole, then the Reformed cannot maintain their dissent from the much more numerous body of Christianity, that opposed their opinions, and sense of Scriptures, at the beginning of the Reformation, and do still oppose them. But, not to stand upon this, I would willingly conform to the unanimous, or most general judgment of the Church Catholic; if I were secure that she could not be mistaken in it. But *I be sense of the Church Catholic is no infallible rule of interpreting Scripture in all things which concern the rule of faith.* Nor may she usurp that royal prerogative of heaven, in prescribing infallibly in matters questioned. *Pror.* You may be secure, that she never erreth in any point necessary. But you tell me, that though she never err in necessities, yet it follows not, that she is an unerring Guide; or witness therein || or, that she must unerringly declare, what points are necessary, and what not; and I must first learn, whether this point of *Consubstantiality* is to be numbered among necessities; before I can be assured, that the sense of the Church Catholic errs not therein.

Pror. But || *Is it a sufficient prescription against any thing which can be alleged out of Scripture, that it ought not to be looked on as the true meaning of Scripture, if it appear contrary to the sense of the Church Catholic from the beginning; and therefore, such doctrines may well be judged destructive to the rule of faith, which have been so unanimously condemned by the Church Catholic, to have Soc. Why so?*

Pror. Because nothing contrary to the necessary Articles of faith can be held by the Catholic Church; for as, very Being depends on its belief of necessities to salvation. *Soc.* This last is most true; but then, if you mean to make your discourse cohere, you must say, it is a sufficient prescription, etc. if it appear contrary to the sense of the Catholic Church, *quia in a point necessary.* For, the reason you give carries, and secures you no further; and then,

* *De Synod.*

§. 14.

† *Still p. 59.*

* *Stillingsf. p. 133.*

† *Stillingsf. p. 154, 152.*

Chilling. p. 150.

--- *Dr. Hammond*

Defence of the Lord

Falkl. p. 23.

§. 15.

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

|| *Stillingsf. p. 59.*

that which you say is no great matter: For here we are still to seek, whether the points we discourse of be, in the affirmative, such a necessary.

§. 16.

† Stillingf.
P. 797.

§. 17.

Prot. But this is ranked among those points which the Church hath put in her Creeds. *Soc.* From the beginning this Article was not in the Creed; and, though it should be granted, that all points necessary are contained in the Creeds, yet all in the Creeds are not thought points necessary: † Necessary so, as to be believed by any before a clear conviction of the divine Revelation thereof: which conviction I yet want.

Prot. But yet, though first the Catholick Church may err in non-necessaries; and 2^{dly}, in what points are necessary, what not, her judgment be not infallible; yet you have still great reason to submit your judgment to hers; because, if it happen to be a point necessary, the is from the divine Promise infallible and unerring in it; not for you. And 3^{dly}. If not necessary, and so both she and you therein liable to err; yet you much the more; and she also in these things is appointed by God for your Teachers; and Guide.

Soc. Therefore I use the help and direction of my spiritual Guides; consider their reasons; do not rashly depart from their judgment; but yet † The due submission of my assent, and belief to them is only to be conditional, with reservation of evidence in God's Word. For in matter of faith (as Dr. Burnet saith) I cannot submit to any compulsion of mine by reservation of my judgment and belief to receive for faith all that they shall deliver, for such reservation stands excluded by the condition of the authority which is not infallible; and by the condition of the matter, faith, of high concernment to our own souls, and so, is accounted for by our selves: who therefore stand bound to seek for faith, and diligently search for that evidence and demonstration from God's Word, upon which we may finally, and securely rely our belief.

|| The Case
between the
Churches,
p. 40.

|| p. 133.

And † The Church determining matters of faith (saith he) ought to manifest it by God's Word; and we may expect such proof, before we yield absolute assent of belief. And so D. Stillingfleet saith † It may ought to be left to judge according to the Rule of the divine Word; because each member of this Society is bound to take care of his soul, and of all things that concern it. Now I for my part see no solid ground out of the Scripture for Consubstantiality, but rather for the contrary; which several of our Writers have made a point to the world. And therefore, unless the Church were either infallible in all she determined, or at least in distinguishing those necessities which are necessary to be in the Creed, it seems no way justifiable, that she put this her definition into the Creed; and, as I conceive, thus requiring from all an absolute consent thereto;

thereto; and not only (as some || would perswade me) a condition, || *Still. p. 70*
 onal, for some of them, *viz.* whenever I shall be clearly convinced,
 that such point is of divine Revelation.

THE III. CONFERENCE.

His Plea, for his not holding any thing contrary to the Definitions of lawful General Councils, the just conditions thereof observed.

That he conceives he owes no obedience to the Council of Nice.

1. Because this cannot be proved to have been a lawful General Council with so much certainty; as is necessary for the ground of his faith, as appears by those many questions mentioned by Mr. Chillingworth, Stillingfleet, and other Protestants, wherein he must first be satisfied, concerning it: which see Dife. 3. §. 86. &c.

2. Because, though this were a General Council, yet it might err even in necessities, if it were not universally accepted, as he can shew, in many places.

3. That, though yielded to be generally accepted, it might err still in non-necessaries; and that Protestants cannot prove this point so he acknowledges.

4. That the Leaders of this Council were plainly a party, contesting this, for many years before, with the other side, condemned by them; and were Judges in their own cause.

5. All these exceptions annulled, and Obedience granted due to this Council; yet, that so, there is due to it not that of assent, but only of silence. §. 19.

6. But yet not that of silence neither from him; considering his present persuasion, that indeed the affirmative in this point is an error manifest, and intolerable: concerning which matter his party having long complained to their Superiors, and produced sufficient evidence; yet these have proceeded to no redress of it. §. 20.

7. But yet that he will submit to the Judgement of a future Council, if it, rightly considering the reasons of his dissent, decree that, which is according to God's Word, and he be convinced thereof, §. 22.

3. **P**ro. But do you not consider, by what persons this Article was long ago inserted into the Creed: Namely, by the first General, and the most venerable, Assembly of the Fathers of the Church that hath been convened since the Apostles times; celebrated under the first Christian Emperor by a perfect Representation of the

§. 281.

the Catholick Church; and by such persons, as came very much purified out of the newly-quenched fire of the greatest persecution, that the Church hath suffered, that under *Dioleſian*, will not you then at least submit your judgment to the Decree of this great, and holy Council; one and the first, of those four, which *S. Gregory* said, he received with the same reverence, as the four Gospels?

Sec. No: And for this I shall give you in brief many reasons, as I conceive, satisfactory. For 1st. Had I an obligation

of submission of judgement to lawful General Councils, you cannot prove this such a one, and those the decrees thereof, which are now extant, with such a certainty, as is necessary to build thereon an Article of my faith. For, to prove this, you must satisfy me in all those things questioned concerning General Councils by *M. Chillingworth*, p. 243. By *Dr. Pierce* in his answer to *Mr. Cressy*, p. 18. &c. By *Mr. Whitby* from p. 228, to p. 433. [where he concludes: 1st. That we never had a General Council. 2^{dy}. That a General Council is a thing impossible.] By *Mr. Stillingfleet*, p. 308. &c. 495. 119. 123. &c.

Who also, against the being of such a General Council as is the Representative of the whole Church Catholick, thus disputes ||—The representation of a Church (saith he) by a General Council, is a thing not so evident, from whence it should come, for if such representation of the whole Church there be, it must either be so by some formal act of the Church, or by a tacite consent. It would not be by any formal act of the Church, for then there must be some such act of the universal Church preceding the being of any General Council; by which they receive their Commission to appear in behalf of the universal Church. Now that the universal Church did ever agree in any such act is utterly impossible to be demonstrated, either that it could be, or that it was. But if it be said, that such a formal act is not necessary, but the tacite consent of the whole Church is sufficient for it; then such a consent of the Church must be made evident, by which they did devolve over the power of the whole Church to such a Representative. And all these must consent in that act whose power the Council pretends to have; of which no foot steps appear. The utmost then (saith he) that can be supposed in this case, is, that the parts of the Church may voluntarily consent to accept of the decrees of such a Council; and, by that voluntary act, or by the supreme authority enjoying it, such decrees may become obligatory.

Thus he. But I suppose its Decrees obligatory, then, only to those parts of the Church, that voluntarily consent to accept of them, as the *Arrians* did not, to receive the Decrees of *Nice*.

Lastly, By * *Bishop Taylor* in the 2^d. Part of his *Dissuasive*, l. 1. §. 1. p. 29. &c. to the end of the Section. Where p. 31. he saith concerning this of *Nice*, that makes for you com-

pared

pared with that of *Ariminum* which makes for us — That, if a
Cath. lick producing the *Nicene Council* be rencountred by an *Arrian*
 producing the *Council of Ariminum* which was far more numerous, here
 are *aquilis aquilæ & pila minantia pilis* : but who shall prevail? If
 a *General Council* be the rule and guide, they will both prevail, that is,
 neither. And it ought not to be said by the *Catholic*; *Tea*, but our
Council determined for the truth, but yours for error: for, the *Arri-*
an will say so too. But, whether they do or no, yet it is plain that they
 may both say so: and if they do, then we do not finde the truth out by
 the conduct and decision of a *General Council*; but we approve this *Ge-*
neral, because upon other accounts we believe that what is there defi-
 ned is true. And therefore *S. Austin's* way here is best, *Neque-*
ego Nicenum Concilium, neque ty. Ariminense, &c. both sides
 pretend to *General Councils*: that which both equally pretend to, will
 help neither; therefore let us go to *Scripture*. And p. 32. — What is
 the reason (saith he of *Councils* in general) that some *Councils* are
 partly condemned; the *Council of Sardis*; that in *Trullo*, those of
Frankford, *Constance*, and *Basil*; but that every man and every
Church accepts the *Councils*, as far as they please; and no further? —
 The *Greeks* receive but seven *General Councils*; the *Lutherans* six, the
English three, *Nestorians* two, &c. — *Pro captu lectoris habent*
sua fata. It is as every one likes. I spare to tell you what he saith,
 p. 26. — That in the first *General Council* of *Jerusalem*, which was
 the first precedent, and ought to be the true measure of the rest, the *Apo-*
stles were the *Presidents*, and the *Presbyters* *Assistants*, but the *Church*
 [viz. the converted brethren and the Laity, see p. 36.] was the *Body*
 of the *Council*, and were *Parties* in the *Decree*, quoting *Act. 15. 22,*
23. and that we can have no other warrant of an authentick *Council*
 than this. 2ly. Though it be shewed a lawfull *General Council*,
 representing the whole *Church* (as it ought, if such) yet what
 obligation can there lye upon me of consenting to it? since it may
 err even in *Fundamentals*, if it be not universally accepted, as in-
 deed this *Council* was not, for several *Bishops* there were, that were
 dissenters in the *Council*, and many more. afterward. || 3ly. || See before,
 Were it universally accepted; yet unless you can shew me by some
 means, that this point, wherein I differ from its judgment, is a fun-
 damental, or necessary point to salvation, both it, and the *Catho-*
lick Church also that accepts it, may err therein. 4ly. The
 judgement of this *Council* seems justly declinable also on this ac-
 count. That whereas the *Guides* of the *Church*, many years before
 this *Council*, were divided in their opinion, *Alexander* *Patriarch* of
Alexandria, and *Hosius* a Favorite of the *Emperor's* heading one
 party; and *Arrian*, and the *Bishops* adhering to him, whom I mentio-
 ned.

- || §. 13. ned formerly || heading another, and whereas afterward, in the prosecution of this difference, both the *forefaint Alexander* in one Provincial Council held in Egypt, and *Hofius* sent thither by the Emperor in another, had there condemned *Arrius*, and his Confederates; yet so it was ordered, that in this General Council assembled for an equal hearing and decision of this Controversie, of these two, professed Enemies to the other party, the one (*Hofius*) was appointed to sit as President of this Council; and the other (*Alexander*) held in it the next place to him; and poor *Arrius*, excluded; and the Bishops, who favoured him in the Council, though at first freely declaring their dissent, yet at last over-ruled to a subscription; as also was *Arrius* himself chiefly by the Emperor *Constantine's* overbearing authority; who, before somewhat indifferent in the contest, yet upon *Arrius* his undutiful, and too peremptory letters, had, some years before, taken great offence at him; and also (as he was very eloquent) publicly written against him || Which over-awing hence appears, in that the same Bishops that were adherents to *Arrius*, when this Emperor being deceased, *Constantinus* his son countenanced their cause, returned, May not to their former opinion only, but to their publick profession of it. By which we may guess, that, if the Controversie had at that time been committed to equal, and disengaged Judges, and such as had not formerly shewed themselves a party: or, if the Oriental Bishops, without any fear of the Prince upon them, might have given free votes, and the *Arrian* cause, had, then, had a *Constantinus* instead of a *Constantine*, (things, wherein Protestants well understand me, because on the same grounds they have rejected the Council of *Trent*) we may presume, then the issue would have been under *Constantine* the same, that it was under his Successor, I say before Judges equal, and indifferent, and not such as were, before, a party, though this party should be compounded of the chief superior Prelates of the Church. For, as Dr. *Stillingfleet* saith, || — We must either absolutely, and roundly affirm, that it is impossible, that the superiors in the Church may be guilty of any error, or corruption; or that, if they be, they must never be called to an account for it; or else, that it may be just, in some cases, to except against them as parties. And if in some cases, then the question comes to this; whether the professing [The speaks of Idolatry, I of Consubstantiality] be some of these cases, or no? And here if we make those superiors Judges again, what we granted before comes to nothing. Prox. No person that is appointed by our Lord to be a Judge in any controversy (as those Bishops you have mentioned were in the cause of *Arrius*) can rightly or properly be said to be, on that side for which he gives Sentence, a Party.

|| See Baro-
nius. A.D.
318, 319.

|| §. 478.

Party. Nor doth their giving sentence vote against any side prejudice them: (as supposed enemies, or opposites, or interested,) from sitting on the Bench; as oft as need requires, to pass it again, alone, or with others. But, if every one may hereafter be called an Anti-party, who once declares himself of a contrary judgment, I perceive Mr. Chillingworth's observation is right. *There are contraries in Religion, which in a manner impossible can be avoided; but the Judge must be a party.* I add also, that in matters of Religion, where every man is concerned, and in great Controversies, especially where is any division of Communion, all both *Lay*, and *Clergy* speedily join, and range themselves on one side, or other; *Clergy* interressing themselves for the necessary direction of their *Subjests*; *Lay*, in obedience to their *Superiors*; neither can such a Judge be nominated; that is not to one side suspected. So that in controversies of Religion, we must deny any Judge (as he did) or this plea that the ordinary Judge, that is assigned us, is a party, must not be easily hearkned to. As for that you urge out of Bishop Taylor, concerning the *Lay* in the first Council at Jerusalem (the pattern to all following) being Parties in the Decree, (I suppose it is meant no further, than that also these may assist in the Council, and give there a consentient, or attesting, but not a decisive, Vote, which neither did the Emperors claim, when they presided therein.) See Dr. Field of the Church, p. 646. As to the second point, *Soc.* But I have not yet said all. For, *gty.* Were there none of the forenamed defects in it, *It is no duty on earth can oblige to internal assent in matters of faith; or to any farther obedience, than that of silence.* Prior. Yes, you stand obliged to yield a conditional assent at least to the Definitions of these highest Courts, i.e. unless you can bring evident *Scriptures*, or *Demonstration* against them. *Soc.* I do not think Protestant Divines agree in this, I find indeed the Arch-Bp. † requiring evidence, and demonstration † §. 32. n. 5. for inferiors *contradicting*, or publishing their dissent, from the Councils decrees, but not requiring thus much for their *denial* of *sid. 5. n. 1.* assent: and I am told † — That in matters proposed by my Superiors, as God's Word, and of faith, I am not to believe as such, till they have manifest it to me to be so; and not, that I am to believe as such, unless between the I can manifest it to be contrary, because my faith can rest on no humane Churches authority, but only on God's Word, and divine Revelation. And Dr. Field saith — † It is not necessary expressly to believe whatsoever Division of the Council hath concluded, though it be true; unless by some other Churches, means it appear untwain to be true; and we be convinced of it in some other sort than by the bare determination of the Council. Till I am convinced then of my error, the obedience of silence is the most, that can be required of me. E e e But

.05.2

p. 60.

.12.2

barn. 1. 21.

16. 5. 10.

§. 10.

Whitby p.

15. — Still p.

506, 537.

§. 32. n. 5.

§. 33. con.

sid. 5. n. 1.

Dr. Ferne

Case bi-

manifest it to me to be so; and not, that I am to believe as such, unless between the

I can manifest it to be contrary, because my faith can rest on no humane Churches

authority, but only on God's Word, and divine Revelation. And

48. 49. &

Division of

p. 45.

p. 666.

§. 20.

Burly. I conceive my self in this point not obliged to this neither; considering my present persuasion, that this Council manifestly erred; and that, in an error of such high consequence (concerning the unity of the most high God) as is no way to be tolerated; and I want not evident Scriptures, and many other unanswerable Demonstrations to shew it did so; and therefore being admitted into the honourable function of the Ministry, I conceive I have a lawful Commission from an higher authority, to publish this great truth of God, and to contradict the Councils decree.

§. 21.

Ap. Lawd

1645.

|| 14p. 229.

Pro. But you may easily mistake that for evident Scripture, and those for Demonstrations, that are not. Concerning which you know, what the Arch-Bp. and Mr. Hooker say. *That they were such, as proposed to any man, and understood, the mind cannot close, but must assent to them.*

You ought therefore first to propose these to your Superiors, or to the Church, defining a redress of such error by her calling another Council. And, if these Superiors, acquainted they with, dislike your demonstrations, which the definition saith, if they be right ones, they must be by all, and therefore by them, assented to; in which, though this is not said by the Arch-Bp. in humility you ought also to suspect these Demonstrations, and remain in silence at least, and no further trouble the Church.

Soc. May therefore no particular person, or Church proceed to a Reformation of a former doctrine, if these Superiors, are complained to, declare the grounds of such persons, or Churches, for it, nor sufficient? Pro. I must not say so. But if they neglect, (as they may) to consider their just reasons so diligently as they ought, and to call a Council for the correcting of such error according to the weight of these reasons, then here is place for inferiors so proceed to a reformation of such error without them.

Pro. And who then shall judge, whether the reasons pretended are satisfactory, or rather the present Church neglects in considering them?

Pro. Here, I confess, to make the Superiors Judges of this, is to cast the Plaintiff before that any Council shall hear his grievance, those Superiors, whose fault appears to adhere to the former Council, being only Judges in their own cause; and so the liberty of complaining will come to nothing.

|| Stilling.

479. 202.

Soc. The inferiors then, that complain, I suppose, are to judge of this. To proceed then. To these Superiors in many diligent writings we have proposed, as we think, many unanswerable Scriptures, and reasons much advanced beyond those presented by our party to the former Nicene Council (and therefore from which evidences of ours we have just cause to hope from a future Council a contrary sentence); and finding

no

expressed by their calling another Council for a reviewing this point, we cannot but conceive it as lawful for a Socinian Church, Pastor, or Bishop, to reform for themselves, and the souls committed to them, in an error appearing to them manifest and intolerable: as for the Protestants, or for Dr. Luther, to have done the same for Transubstantiation, Sacrifice of the Mass, and other points that have been concluded, against the truth, by several former Councils, *Prot.* But such were not *lawful General Councils*, as that of Nice was. *Soc.* Whatever these Councils were, this much matters not, as to a reformation from them: for had they been lawfully General, yet Protestants hold || these not universally accepted may err even in *Fundamentals* not when so accepted, yet may err, in non-fundamentals, errors manifest, and intolerable, and so may be appealed from to future; and those not called, their error presently rectified by such parts of Christianity, as discern it; and also S. Austin || is frequently quoted by them, saying—*That past General Councils erring, may be corrected by other Councils following.* *See before, Disc. 3. §. 34. &c.* *De Baptif. mol. 1. 2. c. 3.*

CONFERENCE

Prot. But I pray you consider, if that famous Council of Nice, hath so erred, another Council called may it also not err, notwithstanding your evidences proposed to it? For, though perhaps some new Demonstrative proofs you may pretend from several Texts more accurately compared, and explained; yet you will not deny this sufficient evidence to have been wantant for that most learned Council to have seen the truth, having then the same entire rule of faith as you now, the Scriptures, (in which, you say, your clearest evidences lie); for their direction. When a future Council (then) is assembled, and hath heard your plea, will you assent to it; and acquiesce in the judgment thereof? *Soc.* Yes; interposing the Protestant conditions of assent, if it *discre* be according to God's Word, and we convinced thereof. *Prot.* Why; such a submission of judgment, and assent I suppose you will presently yield to me in any thing, whereof you are convinced by me; may this future Council, then, challenge no further duty from you? why then should the Church be troubled to call it? *Soc.* Though this former Council also should err, yet it may offer a remedy against inconveniences; which one general inconvenience being, breaking the Church's peace: this is remedied by its authority, if I only yield the obedience of silence thereto.

Prot. But, if your obedience oblige not to silence concerning Councils past, because of your new evidences; neither will it to a future, if you think it also doth err, and either these evidences remain still unsatisfied: Or, these satisfied, yet some other new ones appear, *Stillingf. p. 542.*

† Stillingfl.
ibid.

|| Id. p. 526.

to call for a new consideration. *reductio ad absurdum*. *Sec.* † Because it may also
err, if follow not, *reductio ad absurdum*. and it is probable that it shall not err,
whereas former error is thus discovered, and if the Council proceed
lawfully, be not over-moved. *Sec.* || But however, If I thought upon
this review to be restrained to silence, yet, I am not convinced of the
truth of my decree, this silence is the uttermost, that any future
Council, after its rejecting my reasons, can justly exact of me, *et*
and not belief, or assent, be it it may not oblige me, that I should
relinquish that you call Socinianism at all; but that, not divulge it;
whereas now by the Acts of former Councils (I would gladly know
upon what rational ground) an *Anathema* is pronounced against
me if I do not believe the contrary, and I am declared to stand
guilty of *Heresie* merely for retaining this opinion, which retain-
ing it, is called *obstinacy*, and *contumacy* in me, after the Councils
contrary Definition.

CONFERENCE. IV.

His Plea, for his not being guilty of *Heresie*.

That he cannot rightly, according to Protestant Principles, be ac-
cused or guilty of *Heresie*, for several reasons.

1. Because Protestants holding *Heresie* to be an obstinate defence, of
some error against a fundamental, he thinks, from hence his reason
freed from being an *Heresie*, as long as influence he retains it, unless
he engage further, to a publick pertinacious maintaining thereof. §. 23.
2. Fundamentals varying according to particular persons, and suffi-
cient proposal; none can conclude this point, in the affirmative, to
be, as to him, a fundamental, or, of the truth of which he hath had
a sufficient proposal.
3. That a lawful General Council declaring some point *Heresie*, doth
not necessarily argue, that it is so; because they may err in Funda-
mentals; or at least in distinguishing them from other points. §. 26.
4. That he can have no *auto-catharsis* or *obstinacy*, in a dissenting from
their Definitions, till he is either actually convinced, or at least hath
had a sufficient proposal either of the truth of such point defined:
Or that such Councils have authority to require submission, of judge-
ment, and assent, to their Definitions, of which conviction or suffi-
cient proposal (that varies much, according to the differing conditions
of several persons) as to himself, none can judge save himself: and,
consequently, neither can they judge of his guilt of *Heresie*. Ib.

4. **P**rot. You know, that all *Hereticks* are most justly *anathematized*, and cut off from being any longer members of the Catholick Church; and so do remain excluded also from salvation. Now this *Tenent* of yours hath alwayes been esteemed by the Church of God a most pernicious *Heresie*. **Soc.** I confess *Heresie* a most grievous crime; dread, and abhor it; and trust, I am most free from such a guilt; and from this, I have many ways, of clearing my self. For, *Heresie* (as Mr. *Chillingworth* defines it) || being, not an erring, but an *obstinate* defence of an error; || not of any error, but of one against a *necessary*, or *fundamental*, Article of the Christian faith, || 1st. Though this, which I hold should be an error, and that against a *Fundamental*, yet my silence practised therein, can never be called an *obstinate* defence thereof, and therefore not my tenent an *Heresie*. || 2ly. Since *Fundamentals* vary according to particular persons, and (as Mr. *Chillingworth* saith ||) — No Catalogue thereof, that can be given, can universally serve for all men; God requiring more of them, to whom he gives more, and less of them, to whom he gives less — And that may be sufficiently declared to one (all things considered) which (all things considered) is not to another sufficiently declared: and variety of circumstances makes it as impossible to set down an exact Catalogue of *Fundamentals*; as to make a Coat to fit the Moon in all her changes: And (as Mr. *Stillingfleet* follows him ||) since the measure of *Fundamentals* depends on the sufficiency of the proposition; and none can assigne, what number of things are sufficiently propounded to the belief of all persons, or set down the exact bounds, as to all individuals, when their ignorance is inexhaustible, and when not; or tell, what is the measure of their capacity: what all-wance God makes for the prejudices of Education, &c. Hence I conceive my self free from *Heresie*, in this my opinion, on this score also; because, though the contrary be to some others a *Fundamental* truth, and to be explicitly believed by them; yet to me, as not having any sufficient proposal, or conviction thereof, but rather of the contrary, it is no *Fundamental*, and consequently, my tenent opposing it, if an error, yet no *Heresie*.

Prot. Do not deceive your self; for though, according to different revelations, to those that were without Law; or those under the Law; or those under the Gospel; *Fundamentals*, generally spoken of, might be more to some, than others; yet to all those, who know, and embrace the Gospel, we say ||; all *Fundamentals* are therein clearly proposed to all reasonable men, even the unlearned, and therefore the erring therein, to all such, cannot but be *obstinate*, and *Heretical*. **Soc.** Unless you mean onely this: That all *Fundamentals*, (i.e. so many as are required of any one) are clear

§. 23.

p. 271.

p. 134.

p. 289.

§. 24.

|| *Chillingworth*.

p. 22.

|| Chillingw.

p. 367.

* Id. 101.

§ 25.

to him in Scripture: but not all the same Fundamentals, there, clear to every one: but to some more of them, to some fewer: I see not how this, last said, accords with that said before by the same person. But if you mean thus: then *Consubstantiality*, (the point we talk of) may be a Fundamental to you, and clear in Scripture: but also not clear to me in Scripture, & so no Fundamental; & hence, I think my self safe. For, — || *I believing all that is clear to me in Scripture, must needs believe all fundamentals; and so I cannot incur: Heresie, which is opposit to some fundamental. — The Scripture, sufficiently informing me what is the Faith, must of necessity also teach me, what is Heresie: That which is straight will plainly teach us, what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifest the other.*

Pro. I pray you consider a little better, what you said last; for, since Heresie, as you grant it, is an obdurate defence of error only against some necessary point of Faith; and all truth delivered in Scripture is not such; unless you can also distinguish, in Scripture, these points of necessary Faith from others, you can have no certain knowledge of Heresie: and the believing all that is delivered in Scripture, though it may preserve you from incurring Heresie, yet cannot direct you at all for knowing, or discerning Heresie, or an error against a fundamental or a necessary point of Faith, from other simple and less dangerous errors, that are not so: nor by this, can you ever know, what errors are Heresies, what not; and so, after all your confidence, if by your neglect you happen not to believe some Scriptures in their true sense, you can have no security in your Fundamental, or necessary, Faith; or of your not incurring Heresie.

Neither. Secondly, according to your discourse, hath the Church any means to know any one to be an Heretic; because she can never know the just latitude of his fundamentals. And so Heresie will be a grievous sin indeed; but walking under such a vizard of non-sufficient proposal, as the Ecclesiastical Superiors cannot discover or punish. Therefore, to avoid such confusion in the Christian Faith, there hath been alwaies acknowledged in the Church some authority for declaring Heresie: and it may seem conviction enough to you, that her most General Councils have defined the contrary position to what you maintain; and received it for a *fundamental*. Of which Ecclesiastical Authority for declaring Heresie, thus Dr. Parker, || *The Catholick Church is careful to ground all her declarations in matters of Faith, upon the divine authority of Gods written word. And therefore whosoever wilfully opposeth a judgement so well grounded, is justly esteemed an Heretic; not properly, because he dishonours the Church; but because he yields not to Scripture sufficiently propounded, or cleared unto him [i. e. by the Church.]*

Where

|| p. 97.

Where the Dr. seems to grant these two things: That all that the Catholick Church declares against Heresie, is grounded upon the Scripture; and that all such as oppose her judgement are Hereticks: but only he adds, that they are not Hereticks properly, or formally for this opposing the Church, but for opposing the Scriptures. Whilst therefore the *formal ratio* of Heresie is disputed, that all such are Hereticks seems granted. And the same Dr. elsewhere concludes thus; || *The mistaker will never prove, ||* p. 132. *that we oppose any Declaration of the Catholick Church, [he means such a Church as makes Declarations, and that must be in her Councils] and therefore he doth unjustly charge us with Heresie.* And again, he saith, || *Whosoever opinion these ancient writers ||* p. 103. *[S. Austin, Epiphanius, and others] conceived to be contrary to the common or approved opinion of Christians, that they called an Heresie, because it differed from the received opinion; not because it opposed any formal Definition of the Church: where, in saying, not because it opposed any Definition, he means; not only because. For, whilst that, which differed from the received opinion of the Church, was accounted an Heresie by them, that, which differed from a formal definition of the Church, was so much more. Something I find also, for your better information, in the learned Dr. Hammond, ¶ con- ¶ Titus 3. ¶ II. menting on that notable Text in Titus—A man that is an Heretick after the first and second admonition, reject, [a Text implying, contrary to your discourse, Heresie discoverable, and censurable by the Church,] where he explains *αἰσχροκελευσῶν* self condemned; not to signifie a mans publick accusing, or condemning his own doctrine, or practices; for that condemnation would rather be a motive to free one from the Church's censures. Nor 2ly to denote one that offends against conscience, and though he knows he be in the wrong, yet holds out in opposition to the Church; for so, none but Hypocrites would be Hereticks; and he that stood against the Doctrine of Christ and his Church in the purest times [you may guesse whom he means] should not be an Heretick: and so no Heretick could possibly be admonished, or censured by the Church, for no man would acknowledge of himself, that what he did was by him done against his own conscience, [the plea which you all so here make for your self.] But to be an expression of his separation from, and disobedience to the Church; and so, an evidence of the *ἀπειθήναι* & *ἀναπλάσσειν* his being perverted, and sinning wilfully, & without excuse. [See more Protestants cited to this purpose, Disc. 3. §. 19.] What say you to this?*

Soc. What these Authors say, as you give their sense, seems to me contrary to the Protestant Principles; [See Dr. Potter, p. 165. 162. — D. Hammond of Heresie, p. 7. n. — §. 9. n. 2. Def. of L. Falkl.

§. 26. n.

611. p. 23. — See before Disc. 3. 4. 1. 1. and to their own positions elsewhere; neither, surely, will Protestants tie themselves to this measure, and trial, of *autocatacrisy*. For, since they say; That lawfull General Councils may erre in Fundamentals; these Councils may also define, or declare something *Heretic*, that is not against a Fundamental; and, if so, I, though in this self-convinced, that such is their Definition, yet am most free from Heresie, in my not assenting to it, or (if they err intollerably) in opposing it. Again, since Protestants say, Councils may erre in distinguishing Fundamentals, these Councils may erre also in discerning Heresie, which is an error against a Fundamental, from other errors that are against non-Fundamentals.

Again: Whilst I cannot distinguish Fundamentals in their Definitions, thus no Definition of a General Council may be receded from by me, for fear of my incurring Heresie: a consequence, which Protestants allow not.

Again: Since Protestants affirm all Fundamentals plain in Scripture, why should they place *autocatacrisy*, or self-conviction, in respect of the Declaration of the Church rather, than of the Scripture? But, to requite your former quotations, I will shew in plainer language the stating of Protestant Divines concerning *autocatacrisy* as to the Definitions of the Church, under which my opinion also findes sufficient shelter; *We have no assurance at all* (saith Bishop Bramhall †) *that all General Councils were, and always shall be so prudently managed, and their proceeding: alwayes so orderly, and upright, that we dare make all their sentences a sufficient conviction of all Christians, which they are bound so believe under pain of damnation.* [I add, or under pain of Heresie] — And *Ib.* p. 102. — *I acknowledge* (saith he) *that a General Council, may make that revealed truth necessary to be believed, by a Christian as a point of Faith, which formerly was not necessary to be believed; that is, whensoever the reasons and grounds of truth produced by the Council, or the authority of the Council* (which is, and alwayes ought to be very great with all sober discrete Christians) *do convince a man in his conscience of the truth of the Councils Definitions:* [which truth I am as yet not convinced of, neither from the reasons, nor authority, of the Council of Nice.] Or, if you had rather have it out of Dr. Potter — *It is not resisting* (saith he) *the voice, or definitive sentence, which makes an Heretick, but an obstinate standing out against evident Scripture sufficiently cleared, unto him. And the Scripture may then be said to be sufficiently cleared, when it is so opened, that a good, and teachable mind (loving, and seeking truth)* [my conscience convinceth me not, but that such I am I cannot gainsay it. — Again † — *It is possible* (saith he) *that the sentence of a Council or Church may be erroneous, either because the opinion con-*

† Reply to
Chalced.
p. 105.

|| p. 128.

† p. 129.

demanded

denied to be Heresie, or error against the Faith, in it self considered, or because the party so condemned is not sufficiently convinced in his understanding (not clouded with prejudice, ambition, vain-glory, or the like passion) that he is in error [one of these I account my self.] Or out of Dr. Hammond, it must be lawfull for the Church of God, † Heresie, [any Church, or any Christian, upon the Dissension,] as well as for p. 114. the Bishop of Rome, to enquire whether the Decrees of an Universal Council have been agreeable to Apostolical Tradition or no; and if they be found otherwise, to reject them out, or not to receive them into their belief. And then still it is the matter of the Decrees, and the Apostolicalness of them, and the force of excommunication, whereby they are approved, and acknowledged to be such, which gives the authority to the Council; and nothing else is sufficient, where that is not to be found. And, else where, he both denies in General an Infallibility of Councils, || and grounds the Reverence due to the Four first Councils on || See before, their setting down and convincing the truth of their Doctrine out of the Disc. 1. 9. 6. the Scriptures words understood with piety, & the fetching their Definitions regularly from the sense thereof, which the General Churches had received down from the Apostles. || Upon which follows, that in such case, where a Lawful General Council doth not so, (as possibly it may, and Inferiors are to consider for themselves, whether it doth not) there may be no Heretical autocataphism in a dissent from it, nor this dissent an evidence of the dissenters and apostates being perverted and sinning wilfully, and without excuse. — Lastly, thus Dr. Stillingfleet, concerning Heresie. || The formal reason of || Rat. Ac- Heresie is denying something supposed to be of divine Revelation; and count. p. 73. therefore, 1ly None can reasonably be accused of Heresie, but such as have sufficient reason to believe that that which they deny is revealed by God. And therefore, 2ly. None can be guilty of Heresie for denying anything declared by the Church; unless they have sufficient reason to believe, that whatever is declared by the Church is revealed by God; and therefore the Church's Definition cannot make any Hereticks, but such as have reason to believe, that she cannot err in her Definitions. From hence also he gathers, That Protestants are in less danger of Heresie than Papists, till these give them more sufficient reasons to prove, that whatever the Church declares, is certainly revealed by God. Thus he. Now such sufficient proving reasons, as Protestants plead, that Papists have not yet given them concerning this matter of Church-authority, I alledge, that neither have they, nor others, given me. To be self-condemned, therefore, in my dissent from the definition of the Council of Nice, I must first have sufficient reason proposed to me to believe, (and so to remain self-condemned, and Heretical in disbelieving it) this point; viz. That

the Church, or her Council, hath power to define matters of Faith in such manner, as to require my assent thereto. Which so long as I find no sufficient reason to believe, I suppose I am freed (without obstinacy, or Heresy, or being therein self-condemned, from yielding assent to any particular matter of Faith, which the Church defines. And had I sufficient reason proposed to me for believing this point; yet so long as I am not actually convinced thereof, I become only guilty of a fault of ignorance, not obstinacy, or *incuriositate*, or *heresia*; for, if I am self-condemned, or guilty of obstinacy in disbelieving the foregoing points, *Then I become so, either by the Church's definition of this point, or without it. By reason of the Church's definition of this point, for this very power of defining is the thing in question, and therefore cannot be cleared to me by the Church's defining of it; and thus, That thing is proposed to me in the definition to be believed, which must be supposed to be believed by me already, before such proposal or definition, in else the definition is not necessary to be believed. I don, without, or before such definition, can I have an *argumentum* for, because this auto-catastrophy, you say with Dr. *Helmwind*, arises from my disobedience to the Church.* *Pro. Methinks, you make the same plea for your self in this matter, as if one, that is questioned for not obeying the divine precepts, or not believing the divine revelations delivered in Scripture, should think to excuse himself by this answer, that indeed he doth not believe the Scripture to be God's Word; and therefore he conceives, that he cannot reasonably be required to believe that, which is contained therein. And, as such a person hath as much reason (though this, not from the Scripture, yet from Apostolical Tradition) to believe that Scripture is God's Word, as to believe what is written in it; so have you, though not from the *Nicean* Council defining it, yet from Scripture and Tradition manifesting it, as much reason to believe its authority of defining, as what is defined. Its true indeed, that had you not sufficient proposal, or sufficient reason to know this your duty of Assent to this definition of the Council of *Nice*, you were faultless in it; but herein lies your danger, that from finding a *non-conviction* of the truth, within (hindred thereby I know not what supine negligence, or strong self-conceit, &c.) you gather a *non-sufficient proposal*, without.*

§. 27.

Soc. It remains then to enquire, who shall judge concerning this *sufficient proposal*, or sufficient reason, which I am said to have, to believe what the *Nicean* Council, or the Church hath declared in this point. ¶ Whether the Church's judgment is to be taken by me in this, or my own made use of; *If my judgment* the ground

|| *Stillingfl.*
P. 99.

† *Stillingfl.*
P. 74.

† *Stillingfl.*
P. 99.

|| *Stillingfl.*
P. 73.

ground of any belief and of Heresies fill in the Church's *definition*, and thus it will be all one in effect, whether I believe what she declares, without sufficient reason; or learn this of her, when there is sufficient reason to believe so. It must be then, *my own judgment*; I am so be directed by in this matter: and, if so, then it is to be presumed, that God doth both afford me some means not to be mistaken therein; and also some certain knowledge, when I do use this means right: (for, without these two I can have no security in my own judgment in a matter of so high concernment; as *Hereticke and fundamentall faith* is.) Now this means, in this matter, I presume I have daily used, in that I finde my conscience, after much examination, therein to acquiesce, unless you can prescribe me some other surer evidence, without sending me back again to the *workings of the Church*. *Bro.* Whilst your discovery of your consent to be an *Hereticke* depends on your having sufficient reason to believe it is so. And, 2ly, The judgment of your having, or not having sufficient reason to believe this, is left to your self; the Church hath no means to know you, or any other to be an Hereticke, till they declare themselves to be so. And thus, in striving to free your self from Heresie, you have freed all mankind from it: (as to any external discovery and conviction thereof) and cancelled such sin; unless we can find one, that will confess himself to maintain a thing against his own conscience.

Soc. If I, so do the Protestants; for, they also hold none guilty of *Heresy*, for denying anything declared by the Church, unless they have reason to believe, that whatever is declared by the Church is revealed by God; and of this sufficient reason they make not the Church, or Superiors, but *themselves*; the Judge.

THE V. CONFERENCE

His Plea, for his not being guilty of Schism.

The Sacrament Churches have not forsaken the whole Church
Catholic, or the sacramental Communion of it: but only left
one part of it as was corrupted, and reformed another part. (1st.)
In themselves! Or, shall he, and the Sacrament Churches, being a part of
the Catholic, they be ever separated from the whole, because not
from themselves. §. 28.
What, their separation being for an error unjustly imposed upon
them, and a condition of Communion, the Schism is not theirs, who
made the separation: but theirs, who caused it. §. 29.

Besides that, what ever the truth of things be, yet so long as they are required by any Church to profess they believe, when they believe, their separation cannot be said complete; and so, Schisme is not a necessary consequence. That, though he, and his party had forsaken the external Communion of all other Churches, yet nor the external, in which they remain still united to them: but in that internal Communion of Charity, in not condemning all other Churches as non-Catholic; and in that of Faith, in all Essentials, and Fundamentals; and in all such points, wherein the Unity of the Church Catholick consists. That the doctrine of Consubstantiality for which they departed is denied by them to be any Fundamental; nor can the Churches, from which they depart for it, be a competent Judge against them, that it is so. That, though they are separated from the Ministry, yet not from the Reformed Churches, which Churches have not in the liberty of their own judgment; nor require any internal assent to their doctrine (in which thing else blame the tyranny of the Roman Church). That only a condition, if any be removed of the truth that of God, not a conviction of the contrary. That, in enjoying, and continuing in the Protestant Communion he maketh as full a profession of conformity to his doctrine, as Mr. Chillingworth hath done in several places of his book, which yet was accepted as sufficient.

§. 28.

§. 28. I have yet one thing more, about which to question I will. If you will not acknowledge your opinion, as the opinion opposing the public judgment, and definition of the Catholick Church in that most reverend Council of Nice, upon pretence that you have not had a convincing Proposal, that this Definition was therein made according to God's Word, or the Scriptures; yet, how will you clear your self, or your Socinian Congregations, of Schisme? avoidable upon no plea of adherence to Scripture, if it shall appear, that you have, for this opinion deserted the Communion of the Catholick Church; out of which Church is no Salvation.

† Dr. Potter
p. 75.

† Dr. Potter. I grant, there neither is, nor can be any just cause to depart from the Church of Christ; no more than from Christ himself: therefore, I utterly deny, that our Churches have made any separation from the Church Catholick as the whole Church, or the external Communion of it: but only that part of it, which is corrupted, and still will be so; and have not forsaken, but only reformed another part of it, which part we ourselves are: and I suppose you will not go about to persuade us, that we

|| Chillingworth
p. 274.

1687

1111

have

have forsaken our selves, or our own Communion. And if you urge, that we joined our selves to no other part, therefore we separated from the whole. I say it is not, inasmuch as our selves were a part of it, and still continued so, and therefore can no more separate from the whole, than from our selves.

Pro. So then, it seems, we need fear no Schisme, from the Church Catholick till a part can divide from it self, which can never be.

Soc. Next, As for our separating from all other particular Churches, the ground of our Separation being an error, which hath crept into the Communion of these Churches, and which is commonly imposed upon us in order to this Communion, we consider in this case, if any, *They*, not *We*, are the Schismatics: for as the Arch. Bp. *The Schisme is theirs, whose the cause it is, and he makes the separation, who gives the just cause of it, not he that makes the separation, though a just cause preceding.*

Again. Though we have made an actual Separation from them, as to the not conforming to, or also as to the reforming of an error, yet, in *Act. Charay*, we do still retain with the same Churches our former Communion. *No dividing from them by the breach of Charay. Or condemning all other Churches, as no part of the Catholick Church, and as losing the Communion with our selves, as did those famous Schismatics, the Donatists.* [See *D. Ferns Division of Churches, p. 105. and 31, 32.*]

Next, as to matter of Faith. We hold, that all separation from all particular Churches in such a thing, wherein the unity of the Catholick Church does not consist, is no separation from the whole Church, nor is any thing more, than our suspension from the Communion of particular Churches, till such their error is reformed. For, as *D. Stilling.* *There can be no separation from the whole Church, but in such things, wherein the unity of the whole Church is so lost.*

Whole therefore separates from any particular Church as to things not concerning their being, as unity separated from the Communion of that Church, and not the Catholick. Now, that for which we have separated from other Churches, we conceive not such, as is essential, or concerns the being of a Church so, that without it we, or they, cannot still retain the essence thereof, we declare with our readiness to join with them again, if this error be corrected, or at least not impaired. And (as *Dr. Stilling.* *saith*)

Where there is the readiness of Communion, there is no absolute separation from the Church as such, but only suspending Communion, & finding of all such abuses be reformed. Or not pressed upon us. And, as *Dr. the Church of* *Branchall* *When one part of the Church separates itself*

§. 29.

|| *Lawd. p.* 142.

§. 30.

§. 31.

|| *p. 132.*|| *Stilling. ib.*+ *Vind. c. of* *the Church of* *Engl. p. 29.*

from another part, not absolutely, or in essentials, but respectively in places, and innovations, not as it is a part of the universal Church, but only so far as it is corrupted. And yet I am not whether in doctrine, or manners, if it doth still retain a Communion not only with the Catholick Church, and with all the Orthodox members of the Catholick Church, but even with that corrupted Church, from which it is separated, except only in such Corruptions.

322

Pro. Saving better Judgements, methinks a separation (if causeless) from the Communion of all other Churches, or from those who are our Superiours, in a lesser matter than such a Fundamental or essential point of Christianity as destroys the being of a Church, should be Schism; and the less the point for which we separate, the greater the guilt of our separation. Were not the Donatists Schismatics in rejecting the Catholick Communion, requiring their conformity in such a point in which so great an error before the Church's condemning thereof was very excusable, and the African Congregations in his time not un-church'd thereby?

|| D. Potter

p. 76.

† Stillingf.

p. 359.

|| Division of

Churches, p.

106.

Soc. — But the Donatists and the of the Body of Christ, and the hope of Salvation, the Church from which they were separated, which is the property of Schismatics, and they were fully church'd with Schism, because they separated from the Church, and from their communion. But, as Dr. Potter saith, — The Donatists only used their liberty, and judgment in their practice of excommunicating Heretics, leaving other Churches to their liberty; and though charging them in an error for admitting Heretics, without excommunicating them, yet willing to have Communion with such a part of the Catholick Church (as the practice wherein they differed, when had they not been guilty of Schism). In that which I hold I only follow my conscience, condemn not the Churches holding other-

|| Chillingworth

p. 278.

† Ib. 279.

wile. On the other side || Christ hath forbid the under pain of damnation to receive what I believe not. Be it small, or great, and consequently under the same penalty hath forbid me to receive the Communion, of which I cannot remain without the Hypocritical Profession of such a thing, which I am convinced to be erroneous. At least thus I know that the Doctrine which I have chosen, is no Schism, and the contrary, which I have for taken, seems false. And therefore, without remorse of Conscience, I say what I say, and I cannot, and a separation, for maintaining my conscience, I hold it necessary, and I am satisfied.

33.

Pro. At this rate none will be a Schismatic. But he who knows he erreth (or not who holds it, but only who professeth an error), or who knows, that the point, for the non-conformity to which, required of him, he defers the Church, is a Tith, and the contrary, which he maintains, an error. But Dr. Hammond

† tells

tells you. That he that doth not communicate with those I suppose he means Superiors, the condition of whole Communion contains nothing really necessary or essential, though the doctrine is proposed as the foundation of their Communion. He is apprehended by him, to whom it is thus proposed, to be false, remains in Schism, about the doctrine of the Church, requiring consent to what is intended a truth, will be Schismatick. (and that whether in a point fundamental, or not fundamental) though they have used all the industry, all the means, they can conceive, this, the relying on their Superiors judgment, not to err, unless you will say, that old truths, even not fundamental, are in Schism, to show, that none, using a right industry, can be schismatick from them, which so *Calving* hath maintained, neither to

Pros. But we may let this pass, for your Assertion was in a point perspicuous enough in Scripture, (and to you void of such exceptions): was in a point Essential and Fundamental, and in which a wrong belief destroys any longer Communion, not only with the Bishop, or Church, or with the Catholic, but even with the very Body; nor is it by what way this can ever be proved against you; for you can assigne no Ecclesiastical Judge that can distinguish Fundamentals, Necessaries, or Essentials, from those points that are not so; as hath been shew'd already. And as Dr. *Stillingfleet* says, I argue, concerning Heresy, so may I concerning Schism.

What are the measures whereby we ought to judge what things are essential to the being of Christianity or of the Church? Whether must the Church's judgment be taken, or every man's own judgment? if the former, the Ground of Schism lies full in the Church's definitions, contrary to what Protestants affirm: if the latter, then no one can be a Schismatick, but he, that opposes that, of which he is, or may be convinced, that it is a Fundamental, or essential matter of faith. If he be only a Schismatick, that opposes that, of which he is shew'd, then no man is a Schismatick, but he that goes against his present judgment; and so there will be few Schismaticks in the world. If he that opposes that, which he may be convinced of, then again, it is that, which he may be convinced of, either in the Church's judgment, or in his own. If in the Church's, it comes to the same issue, as in the former. If in his own: how, I pray, shall I know, that I may be convinced of what, using a due endeavour, I am not convinced already? or how shall I know, when a due industry is used? and, if I cannot know this, how should I ever settle my self, unless it be upon the way, which you allow not. Again, I am taught, that any particular, either person, or Church, may judge for themselves

5. 34
22

11-73

100:9†

† Stillings.
p. 292.

with the Judgment of Discretion. And, in the matter of Christian
 Communion, — That nothing can be more unreasonable, than that
 the Society [suppose it be a Council] imposing conditions of its
 Communion. Suppose the Council of Nice imposing Conditions
 any to I should be Judge, whether these conditions be just, and equi-
 table, or no. And especially in this case, where a Council should Judge of
 Christians, Judge such things, required to be in themselves conditions of com-
 munion, what Justice or reason is there, that the party accused should sit
 Judge in his own cause? *Pro.* By this way no Separatist can
 ever be a Schismatick, if he is constituted the Judge, whether the
 reason of his separation is just. *Ans.* And in the other way,
 there can never be any just cause of separation at all, if the Church-
 Governors, from whom I separate, are to Judge, whether there be
 an error, for which I separate.

9. 35.

Pro. It seems something that you say; But yet though up-
 on such consideration, a free use of your own judgement, as to pro-
 viding for your own salvation, is granted you; yet methinks, in
 this matter you have some greater cause to suspect it, since several
 Churches, having of late taken liberty to examine by Gods Word
 more strictly the corrupt doctrines of former ages, yet these refo-
 rmed, as well as the other un-reformed, stand opposite to you; and
 neither those professing to follow the Scriptures, nor those profes-
 sing to follow Tradition, and Church-authority, neither those re-
 quiring strict discipline and submission of judgment; nor those in-
 dulgencing Christian liberty, countenance your doctrine. But you stand
 also reformed of the reformation, and separated from all.

Soc. Soft a little. Though I stand separated indeed from the
 present un-reformed Churches; or also (if you will) from the whole
 Church that was before *Paulus*; yet I both enjoy the external
 Communion, and still I have reason to account myself a true
 member, of the Churches Reformed; and will never condemn
 them; or thought Salvation not attainable in them; so neither am
 I (that I know of) excluded by, or from, them; so long as I re-
 tain my opinion in silence, and do not disturb their peace; and I
 take my self also on these terms to be a member in particular of
 the Church of *England*, where I have been educated. For, all
 these Churches (as confessing themselves faulty in their doctrine)
 do not require of their Subjects to yield any *internal* assent to their
 doctrines, or to profess any thing against their conscience; and
 in Hypocrisie; and do forbear to use their tyranny upon any for
 enjoying their Communion, which they so much condemn in that
 Church, from which for this very thing they were forced to part
 Communion; and to reform. Of this manner thus, *Mr. Whit*

† p. 100.

— Whom

—with their dissent. Conventions, yet damn for us internally receiving their doctores? Do they not leave every man so the liberty of his judgement? They do not require, that we should in all things believe as they believe; but that we should submit to their determination, and not contradict them; their decisions are not obtruded as infallible Oracles, but only submitted in an order to peace, and unity. — So that their more rather to silence, than to determine disputes. &c. — and p. 438. We grant a necessity, or at least a convenience of a Tribunal to decide controversies, but how? Not by causing any person to believe what he did not antecedently to these decrees, upon the sole authority of the Council; but by silencing our disputes, and making us acquiesce in what is pronounced without any publick opposition to it, keeping our opinions to our selves. — A liberty of using private discretion in approving or rejecting anything as delivered, or put, in Scripture, we think ought to be allowed; for faith cannot be compelled; and by taking away this liberty from men, we should force them to become Hypocrites, and so profess outwardly what inwardly they disbelieve. — And see Dr. Stillingfleet's Rational Account, p. 104. where, speaking of the obligation to the 39. Articles, he saith, — That the Church of England, excommunicates such as openly oppose her doctrine, supposing her fallible; the Roman Church excommunicates all, who will not believe what ever she defines to be infallibly true. — That the Church of England bindeth men to peace to her determinations, reserving to men the liberty of their judgments on pain of excommunication if they violate that peace. — For in explanation the one side, where a Church pretends infallibility, the excommunication is directed against the persons for refusing to give internal assent to what she defines; But where a Church doth not pretend to that, the excommunication respects wholly that overt Act, whereby the Church's peace is broken. — And if a Church be bound to look to her own peace, no doubt she hath power to excommunicate such as openly violate the bonds of it; which is only an act of caution in a Church, to preserve her selfe in unity; but where it is given out, that the Church is infallible, the excommunication must be so much the more unreasonable, because it is against those internal acts of the mind, over which the Church as such, hath no direct power. — And p. 35. he quotes these words out of Bp. Bramhall's To the same sense, — We do not suffer any man to reject the 39. Article of the Church of England at his pleasure; guarded, yee neither do we look upon them as essentials of saving faith, or legacies of Christ, and his Apostles; but, in a mean, as pious opinions forced for the preservation of unity, neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them. — By which we see what vast difference there is, between such things as are required by the Church of England to order of peace, and those which are imposed by the Church of

H p. 200.

Rome &c. Lastly, thus Mr. Chillingworth† of the just authority of Councils and Synods (beyond which the Protestant Synods, or Convocations pretend not.) — *The Authority of the Church* (saith he) *in after times* [i. e. after the Apostles] *might have just cause to declare their judgment, touching the sense of some general articles of the Creed: but to oblige others to receive their determinations under pain of damnation, what warrant they had? Answer. He does not shew, either that the Church of all ages was to have this authority; or, that it continued in the Church for some ages, and then expired: For, that can shew either of these things for him; for my part I cannot. For I willingly confess the judgment of a Council, though not infallible, is yet so authoritative, and obliging, that such an appeal may reason to the contrary) it may be shew itself, as long as ever offered it in the world submission for publick use & sale. [Thus much, as the Protestant Synods seem contented with, so I allow.] Again p. 375. He saith —, *Anything besides Scripture; and the plain, unfraggable, indubitable, consequences of it, Well may Protestants hold in as matter of opinion; but, as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe to themselves; nor can they give the belief of it, of others; without most high and most schismatical presumption.* Thus he: now I suppose that either no Protestant Church or Synod will tell the Son's coequal God-head with the Father a plain, unfraggable, indubitable Scripture, or consequence thereof; about which is, and hath been, so much contest; or, with as much reason, they may call whatever points they please such, however controverted; and then, what is said here signifies nothing.*

§. 36.

Præ. Be not mistaken, I pray, especially concerning the Church of England. For though she, for several points, imposed formerly by the tyranny of the Roman Church, hath granted liberty of opinion; or at least freed her subjects from obligation to believe so in them, as the Church formerly required, yet, as to conclusion of your doctrine, she professeth firmly to believe the three Creeds; and, concerning the additions made in the two latter Creeds to the first, Dr Hammond† acknowledgeth: — *That they being thus sealed by the universal Church, now, and still are in all reason, without disputing, to be received and embraced by the Protestant Church, and every meek member thereof; with that reverence, that is due to Apostolick truths; with that thankfulness, which we can more tribute to those sacred Champions; for their invaluable and provident propagating our faith; with such timely and necessary application to practice; than the Holy Ghost, speaking so many and so many of the New Testament by the Governors of the Christian Church, & Christian and their successors in the Prophetic, Pastoral, & Episcopall Office, and had*

† Of Fundamentals,
p. 90.

had formerly spoken by the Prophets of the Old Testament, sent immediately by him, may find a cheerful audience, and receive all uniform submission from us. Thus, Dr. Hammond of the Church of England assents to the three Creeds. She assenteth also to the definitions of the four first General Councils: And the Act 1. Eliz. || declares *Heretic*, cap. 1. that, which hath been adjudged to by them; now in the definitions of these first 4. General Councils your tenent hath received a mortal wound. But lastly, the 4th. Canon in the English Synod held. 1640. † particularly styles *Socinianism* a most damnable † Can. 4. and cursed Heretic, and contrary to the Articles of Religion established in the Church of England: and orders that any, convicted of it, be excommunicated, and not absolved, but upon his repentance, and abjuration. Now further than this [namely, excommunication upon conviction.] No other Church I suppose hath, or can proceed against your Heretic; It being received as a common Axiom in the Canon Law; that *Ecclesia non judicat de occultis*.—And—*Cogitationum penam nemo patitur*.—And—*Ob peccatum meri internum Ecclesiastica censura fieri non potest*. And in all Churches every one, of what internal persuasion soever, continues externally at least a member thereof, till the Church's censures do exclude him.

Soc. The Church of England alloweth, assenteth to, and teacheth, what she judgeth evident in the Scripture; for so the ought; what she believes, or assenteth to, I look not after, but what she enjoys. Now I yield all that obedience in this point, that she requires from me; and so I presume she will acknowledge me a dutiful Son.

Prot. What obedience when as you deny one of her chiefest, and most fundamental, doctrines? §. 37.

Soc. If I mistake not her principles, she requires of me no internal belief or assent to any of her doctrines, but only, 1st. *silence*, or *non-commutation* †; or 2dly, a *conditional belief*, i. e. whenever I shall be † See Disc. 3 convinced of the truth thereof. Now in both these I most readily §. 84. n. 2. & obey her. For the 1st, I have strictly observed it, kept my opinion n. 4. to my self; unless this my discourse with you hath been a breach of it; but then I was at least a dutiful subject of this Church at the beginning of our discourse; and for the 2d, whether *actual conviction*, or *sufficient proposal*, be made the condition of my assent, or submission of judgment, I am conscious to my self of no disobedience, as to either of these; for an *actual conviction* I am sure I have not: and, supposing, that I have had a *sufficient proposal*, and do not know it, my obedience, upon the Protestant principles, can possibly advance no further, than it now doth. The *Apostles Creed* I totally embrace, and would have it the standing bound of a Christian Faith. For other *Creeds*: I suppose, no more belief is

† p. 70. 71.

necessary to the Articles of the *Nicene Creed*, than is required to those of the *Athanasian*. And, of what kind the necessity is of believing those, Dr. Stillingfleet states on this manner — That the belief of a thing may be supposed necessary, either as to the matter, because the matter to be believed is in it self necessary; or because of the clear conviction of men's understandings; that, though the matters be not in themselves necessary, yet being revealed by God, they must be explicitly believed: but then, the necessity of this belief doth extend no further, than the clearness of the conviction doth. Again, that the necessity of believing any thing arising from the Church's definition [upon which motive you seem to press the belief of the Articles of *Confession*] doth depend upon the Conviction, that whatever the Church defines is necessary to be believed. And, where this is not received as an antecedent principle, the other cannot be supposed. [Now this principle neither I nor yet Protestants, accept]. Then he concludes — That as to the *Athanasian Creed* [and the same it is for the *Nicene*] it is unreasonable to imagine, that the Church of England doth own this necessity, purely on the account of the Church's definition of those things which are not fundamental, it being directly contrary to her sense in her 19th. and 20th. Articles. [Now, which Articles of this Creed are not Fundamental, she defines nothing; nor do the 19, 20. or 21. Articles own a necessity of believing the Church's Definitions, even as to Fundamentals.] And hence, that the supposed necessity of the belief of the Articles of the *Athanasian Creed* must, according to the sense of the Church of England, be resolved, either into the necessity of the matters, or into that necessity, which supposeth clear conviction, that the things therein contained are of divine Revelation. Thus he. Now, for so many Articles as I am either convinced of the matter to be believed, that it is in it self necessary; or, that they are divine Revelations, I do most readily yield my faith, and assent thereto. Now, to make some Reply to the other things you have objected,

§ 38

The Act 1^o Eliz. allows no Definitions of the 1st. General Councils in declaring *Heresie* but with this limitation, that, in such Councils, such thing be declared *Heresie* by the express and plain words of the *Canonical Scripture*. On which terms I also accept them.

§ 39.

Dr. Hammond's affirming, That all additions settled by the *Universal Church* [he means General Councils] are in all reason, without disputing, to be received as *Apollitical Truths*, that the Holy Ghost speaking to us by the Governors of the Christian Churches, Christ's Successors, may receive all uniform submission from us, suits not with the Protestant Principles often formerly mentioned. † For thus

|| See before,
§. 26.

(if

(if I rightly understand him) all the definitions of General Councils; and, of the Christian Governors in all ages, as there being still Christs Successors, are to be, without disputing, embraced as truths Apostolical.

If the words of the fourth Canon of the English Synod 1549. *9. 40.* signify any more, than this, That any person, convicted of Socinianism (i. e. by publishing his opinion) shall upon such conviction, be excommunicated; and if it be understood adequate to this, *Qui non crediderit filium esse unigenitum Deo Patri, Anathema sit*; and, that the Church of England, for allowing her Communion, is not content with *silence* in respect of Socinianism, but obligent men also to *assent* to the contrary; then, I see not upon what good grounds such exclamation is made against the like Anathemas or excommunications required by that of *Trent*, or other late Councils, or by *Pius* his Bull. If it be said here, the reason of such faulting them is, because these require assent, not being lawful *General Councils*; such reason will not pass. Because, neither the English Synod, exacting assent in this point, is a General Council. 2ly. Because, it is the Protestant re-

nant, that neither may lawful General Councils require assent to all their Definitions. Or, if it be affirmed (either of *General*, or *Provincial Councils*) that they may require assent under Anathema to some of their decrees; *Viz.* Those evidently true, and divine Revelation; such as *Consubstantiality* is; but may not to others; *Viz.* Those not manifested by them to be such; then, before we can censure any Council for its Anathemas; or its requiring of assent, we must know, whether the point, to which assent is required, is, or is not, evident divine Revelation. And then, by whom, or how, shall this thing touching the evidence of the Divine Revelation be judged; or decided? for those that judge this, whoever they be, do sit now upon the trial of the rightness, or mistake, of the judgment of a General Council? Or when, think we, will those who judge this (i. e. every person for himself) agree in their sentence?

Again: If, on the other side, the former Church in her language, *Si quis non crediderit, &c. Anathema sit*, be affirmed (to which purpose the fore-mentioned Anathemas are urged by you) to mean nothing more, than, *Si quis Hæc in suam pacem professus, & hujus professionis convictus fuerit, Anathema sit*. Thus the Protestants former quarrel with her passing such Anathemas will be concluded causeless, and unjust. But indeed, though, (according to the former sentences), her Anathema is not extended to the internal act of holding such an opinion, if wholly concealed, so far as to render such person for it to stand excommunicated, and lie actually under

under this censure of the Church, because hitherto no contempt of her authority appears, nor is any damage infered to any other member of her Society thereby: Yet her *Anathema* also extends, even to the internal act, or tenet, after the Church's contrary definition known (which tenet also then is not held without a disobedience, and contempt of her authority) so far, as to render the delinquent therein guilty of a very great *mortal sin*; and so at the same time internally cut off from being a true member of *Christ's Body*: though externally he is not as yet to cut off. And the Casuists further state him *ipso facto* to be excommunicated; before, and without conviction, if externally he doth, or speaketh any thing, whereby he is convincible, and not if there be any thing proved against him, but if any thing at least *probable*; and such a one, upon this to be obliged in conscience, not only to confesse his heretical opinion, for his being absolved from *mortal sin*; but also to seek a release from excommunication incurred, for his rejoyning the Church's *Communion*. Thus you see a rigor in this Church towards what is once accounted *Heresy* much different from the more mild Spirit, and moderate temper of the *Reformed*.

§. 47.

To conclude. For the enjoying the *Protestant Communion*, I conceive that, as to any necessary approbation of her *Doctrines*, it is sufficient for me to hold with Mr. *Chillingworth* (as I do) *That the doctrine of Protestants, though not that, of all of them, absolutely true, yet is free from all impiety, and from all Error destructive to Salvation, or in it self damnable.* And *whatsoever hath been held necessary to Salvation by the consent of Protestants, or even of the Church of England, [which, indeed, hath given no certain Catalogue at all of such necessities:] that, against the Socinians, and all others whatsoever, I do verily believe, and embrace.* And (which is still the same) *I am persuaded that the constant doctrine of the Church of England, is so pure, and Orthodox, that whosoever believes it, and lives according to it, undoubtedly he shall be saved.* [For if all truths necessary to Salvation be held in it, then, so is no error, opposite, or destructive to Salvation, held by it; and so, living according to the truths it holds, I may be saved.] Again, *I believe that there is no error in it, which may necessitate, or move any man to disturb the peace, or renounce the Communion of it.* [For, though I believe *Antisocinianism*, an error; Yet if I hold it not such, as that for it any man may disturb the peace, or ought to renounce the Communion, of the Church, I may profess all this, and yet hold Socinianism.] Lastly as he, *†* *saith, — Præsumo, any thing out of of the Bible, seems never so incomprehensible, I will*

† Chillingw.

Pref. §. 39.

† Ib. §. 28.

† Ib. §. 9.

† Ibid.

|| Chillingw.

p. 376.

I will subscribe it with hand, and heart. In other things [that I think not contained in this Book]. I will take no mans liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me ; for I am fully assured, that God doth not, and therefore that men ought not, to require any more of any man, than this ; To believe the Scripture to be Gods Word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it ; and to live according to it. Without pertinacy I can be no Heretick ; And †, endeavouring to find the true sense of Scripture, I cannot but hold my error without pertinacy, and be ready to forsake it, when a more true, and a more probable sense shall appear unto me. — And then, all necessary truth being plainly set down in Scripture, I am certain by believing Scripture to believe all necessary truth ; and in doing so, my life being answerable to my faith, how is it possible I should fail of Salvation ? † Ib. §. 37.

Thus Mr. Chillingworth speaks perfectly my sense.
Prot. I see no other cure for you: but that you learn humility and mortification of your Understanding (in which lies the most subtle, and perilous of all Prides): And, it will reduce you to Obedience: and this, to Truth; That, with all the Church of God, you may give glory to God the only begotten Son, and the Holy Ghost, coessential with God the Father. To which Trinity in Unity, as it hath been from the beginning, and is now, so shall all Honour, and Glory be given, throughout all future ages. Amen.

all Honour and Glory be given throughout all ages. Amen.
 O my, as it hath been from the beginning, and is now, so shall
 Help God! coessential with God the Father. To which Trinity in
 of God, you may give glory to God the only begetter Son, and the
 you to Obedience: and this, to Trinity: that with all the Church
 most subtle and perilous of all Priests: And it will reduce
 finally and mortification of your Unthankfulness (in which lies the
 cure. For I see no other cure for you: but that you learn
 Salvation? Thus Mr. Chillingworth speaks perfectly my
 life being acceptable to my Father, how is it possible I should fail of
 believing Scripture to believe all necessary things: and in doing so, my
 necessary truth being plainly set down in Scripture, I am certain by
 true, and a more probable sense shall appear unto me. — And then, all
 my error without controversy, and be ready to for it; when a more
 according to it. Without controversy I can be no Heretic; And if
 to be God's Word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it; and to have
 to reduce any words of any man; than this; I believe the Scripture
 and fully assured, that God doth not, and therefore that men ought not
 want from him; neither shall any man take mine from me; for I
 not contained in this Book. I will take no man's liberty of judge-
 I will subscribe it with hand and heart. In other things I think

EXPLICA

EXPLICATIONS
CONCERNING
The Resolution
OF
FAITH

Against some Exceptions.

Printed in the Year, 1674.

EXPLICATIONS
CONCERNING
The Revolution
OF
F A I T H

Against some Exceptions.

Printed in the Year, 1674.

EXPLICATIONS

Concerning the

Resolution of FAITH

In Defence of the Resolution of Faith (in the Third Discourse preceding, § 11.) against Dr. Stillingfleet's Reply in his Second Discourse, chap. 1. It is necessary, I pre-represent to the Reader some things, the not understanding of which hath furnished Dr. St. with the pretence of a superfluous Answer (as will appear in the short remarks I shall make upon it.)

I. Concerning Church-Infallibility.

Conf of the Catholick Church, assisted by the Holy Ghost, promised to it by our Lord, is affirmed by Catholics to be a Divine Revelation and one of the Articles of our Faith delivered both by Scripture, and also (abstracting from it) by Tradition, as qualified with other prudential Motives. Against this Tradition, which delivers to us, among other Articles of Faith, this Church-Infallibility as divinely assisted, is affirmed by Catholics to have a sufficient certainty and self-evidence in it that needs no further proof. Yet doth this sufficient certainty of Tradition no way render that Church-Infallibility as divinely assisted which is testified, useless or needless, because this Tradition hath not the same clearness, as to the delivery of all other points of Necessary Faith, especially as to all manner of Christians, as it hath for this of Church-Infallibility; no, not in the delivery of the true sense, in all controverted places of Scripture touching such points; nor in several necessary deductions that are made from other points of faith more clearly Traditional; in which a certainty of our faith therfore is built upon the Definitions, from time to time, of this Infallible Church.

Concerning Divine Faith. This faith is affirmed by Catholics (but so also by Protestants) to be found or felt it self always (as to the essence which it chiefly exerts) depends upon, and reposes its confidence in, on Divine Revelation, or God's own Word, not Man's. But this Faith is not assisted or found it self on Divine Revelation so (as some Protestants, and this Author, will understand it) for, so it concerns him, so what

The Infallibility Note 1.

Note 2.

we can to beat him from it,) not so, I say, as if the *Ground*, or *Motive*, or *Proof* of such particular Proposition, as a Divine Faith believes to be a Divine Revelation, must always also be some other Divine Revelation ; For, this would carry with it such an absurdity, that either Divine Revelations must prove and confirm one another *in infinitum* ; or this Divine Faith rest in some *one* Divine Revelation, without any other ground or reason at all to believe it such ; but, that a sufficient ground or assurance or proof to this Faith of such a thing its being a Divine Revelation is the forementioned Tradition : which Tradition, though it be the *object* only of a *humane* faith, yet nothing hinders that it be the *ground* or *proof* precedent to a Divine ; neither needs this Divine Faith any other, or greater, ground or proof. Meanwhile its acts are always directed to, and its confidence reposed in the Divine Revelation, the Evidence whereof it hath from another thing, Tradition ; and of which Divine Revelation it hath no more certainty at all, than this Tradition affords it.

For, as R. H. hath observed §. 134. p. 273. the strength of our belief of several things, that are all related to us by the same and creditable person, may be very various and far beyond, or also short of, that which we give to the veracity of the Relater, according to the different esteem of the veracity, skill, &c. we have of those persons of whom he relates such things. — When the *authority* of the Relater (saith he) is the same, yet the things related are diversely believed by us, according to the varying of the ground to, or what authority which the Relater urges to make them credible. When a very credible person relates to me several things which he hath heard of two other persons, of whom I have a very different esteem ; the one accounted by me very skilful and learned in his art ; the other not so ; he gives an assent or belief to the words of those two persons, though both related to me with the same fidelity, very different ; much more yet rather related words of him whom I esteem to be a more infallible in this skill, much weaker to the other ; and I give a third assent different from both to the veracity of the Relater, or to the veracity of the person relating these things to me concerning them. See also in R. H. §. 152. where it is said, that, Christians concerning Divine Revelations related to them do not believe with a rational and acquisitive Faith but Tradition of the Successors of the Apostles and approved masterful as shown by all these prudential Motives mentioned before to Latitudo Multitudo, their Sanctity, their Martyrdomes in testimony thereof &c. — But when applying themselves to the things related, which are said to have been revealed and delivered first by God's Personified with most infallible Miracles, they do believe these things related,

related, with yet an higher and a Divine Faith effected in them by the Holy Spirit, and resting its self not on the veracity of these Testimony Relaters, but on the veracity of God himself, from whom these Revelations are said originally to come (yet the rational introduction of all this faith being the veracity of those who immediately convey the Testimony of these things to them). And see Bp. Burnet saying some such thing in his Answer to F. Fisher p. 23. When a Preacher saith he is a true Protestant Doctrine, we believe both the Tradition and the Doctrine, yet we resolve not our faith solely and principally into the authority of the Preacher, but into the Divine Verity itself preached by him. Every thing by which we are moved to believe, and without whose authority we should not believe, is taken into our consideration, but when this Divine Faith is fully resolved on, as appears by the following Preaching, Instruction of Parents &c. And p. 139. That is not upon the last ground of Resolution, upon whose voice and testimony we believe first of all, or priorate ordinis, vel temporis, believe that, or believe where there may be other grounds of belief, equally or of more authority, than the first voice or Testimony, And Archbishop Burnet p. 82. saying that is the first instance of belief, and by which either the principal Motive, or the chief and last Object of faith is proposed to us, may rest his faith. This is the first instance of belief, and by which either the principal Motive, or the chief and last Object of faith is proposed to us, may rest his faith.

p. 16 p. 82.

That then, on which a Divine Faith ultimately rests for my adherence to it, though not for my evidence of it, is Divine Revelation, not Tradition, and in its resting on Divine Revelation it rests on something that is infinitely far more certain than Tradition is, but not known to be more certain than the Certainty which Tradition affords me concerning it, that it is Gods Word, or a true Divine Revelation; so that it is, if such, absolutely impossible to be false. Thus a much greater belief and credence the Divine Faith gives to the Divine Testimony, related to it, than Tradition, than it does to the Tradition, or rather greater credit and credit; but I do not say, that it is greater certainty thereof, than it has of Tradition; neither indeed, absolutely to much certainty as this, which such Tradition affords it: for, many Catholics, especially the Vulgar and unlearned, are affirmed to have a Divine and saving Faith, without being assured thereof by such a Tradition.

To speak this plainly yet, if I can, to avoid further mis takes or Cavils. I believe or am persuaded that it is morally or naturally (speaking of humane nature) impossible that an unanimous and Universal Tradition, of such Persons as are represented in the Motives, can deceive me in their Relation (though it is as yet I cannot say, that it is absolutely impossible;

that all the Men in the world at the same time, in the most serious manner say (I tell a lye). 2. Next, These tell me, and their sufficiently self-evident Testimony obligeth me to believe, that such a particular proposition is Divine Revelation or God's Word; and consequently to believe this proposition, if God's word, to be, not rationally, or naturally, (as I believe the former humane testimony to be), but most absolutely infallible, and impossible to be false; (for, I know by the light of Nature or right Reason, not believe by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, that all Gods Words are so). 3ly. Here I believe or assent (as with an assent of belief or Credibility) to, such proposition that it is Gods Word, and so, absolutely impossible to be false; but the believers hold the Tradition or Relation of such Persons, to be, only morally or naturally so. Here then are two, different beliefs, or persuasions, or, if you will, adherences to the truth of the Infallibility of these two: the Relation itself, and the thing related; and one of these transcending the other, as to a much higher estimation and Appreciation, affection and affection. I have said for the former, than the latter. 4ly. But now, leaving this aside, which order is different; and coming to the Tradition, I have of the one, or the other of these: Here I say, the Certainty I have of the higher, viz. That such a Proposition is Gods Word; and, if so, consequently absolutely impossible to be false, is no greater than that of the lower, viz. the Veracity of the Relaters to me, that such proposition is Divine Revelation, or Gods Word. On one both no certainty, in his faith, of such a Proposition, its being impossible to be false but upon supposition that it is Gods Word. Nor again of this, but upon supposition that the Tradition, delivering it, is true. Where Next, That these two Propositions do well consist together: Namely this; That a Divine Faith always believes, or is obliged to believe, that its Object is Gods Word, and so is obliged to believe, that it is most impossible to be false; and this; That a Divine Faith is so obliged to be infallibly certain that such proposition is Gods Word; or that it may not possibly be false. For, the Proposition, which I believe, (but not certain, whether it is with a Divine Faith that I believe it) to be impossible to be false, may yet possibly be false: Or, my believing the impossibility of such a thing's being false, excludes not necessarily its possibility of being false. Again; That these two Propositions well consist: That the Object of a Divine Faith can never possibly be false. (for, nothing is or can be the Object of such a Faith, but what is truly Divine Revelation). And; That who believes with a Divine Faith is not certain that the Object of his Faith may not possibly be false; if he be

be not (as he may not be) certain, that such his Faith is Divine; though indeed it be Divine. So that it is true: That a Divine Faith believing that a thing is impossible to be false necessarily excludes the possibility of its being false. Because it is not a Divine Faith, if the Object it apprehends to be, be not also truly, God's Word: and yet true also; That a Divine Faith is not certain concerning it self, that it is a Divine Faith; and so neither certain, but that its Object may not be God's Word, and so may also be possibly false. I speak as to any further Certainty concerning its object's being so, than that which Tradition qualified with the Motives of faith in

27. This Divine Faith is said to be, as to include, not so possible as to the thing believed, (and so is an expression used by Protestants as well as Catholics) but is said to be understood 1. Either in respect of its Object, because the thing believed, viz. God's Word, is such as cannot possibly deceive. 2. Or in respect of the Subject and person believing; intimating who he is, and his adherence to, and a confidence in, the truth of such Object, beyond that he hath to things the most infallible, and of which he hath the greatest evidence; be it whatever Science, or Demonstration, or else, intimating, that he hath, or may have, a sufficiently certain, or infallible evidence also thereof; but then this evidence is no more, or other, than that which the forementioned Tradition sets forth; Concerning which certainty, that I may not be here any way mistaken, I refer the Reader to what hath been said before, Disc. 2. c. 11. §. 13, n. 9. where Tradition is made also by Protestants and the ground of their belief, and testimony, (on which they build that they call Divine Faith) is God's Word, and which Tradition there want not those Catholics, that could give us such an evidence, as the Pope, though passing, as affirming, such a natural or moral, to be an absolute, infallible, and

Note 3.

These things pressed, which are very perspicuously set down by R. H. we shall see, in the following Annotations, how easily they may solve all this Author's Knots, and answer his queries. *Annotations*

the not (as he may not be) certain, that such his Faith is Divine; so that it is true: That a Divine Faith

Animal questions on Dr. Stillingfleet's Answer to R. H. about

if the Object it apprehends to be, be not all true, God's Word:

On bio. 6.1.

Evidence Page 297. Add at the bottom is hereby required beyond all proportion in degree of evidence, the Affert required being sufficient: and the Evidence only probable and prudential Measures.

Reply. Concerning the meaning of an Infallible Assent, required by Catholics in a Divine Faith. See before Note 3. Where it is denied, That to a Divine Faith any certainer, either assent, proof,

or assurance is necessary that the Revelation it believes is Divine, than that which the forementioned Tradition qualified with the Motives affords. In which matter we acquiesce so what the Dr with approbation quotes out of Dr. Hales p. 303. but the same is said also by G. H. plainly enough. See p. 137. p. 275. where he saith—*That God's Revelation is believed not for infallibility, but only for credibility sake, both from these principles, which right reason concerning its verity sufficiently so. And—that God hath not obligated to believe Christianity as infallibly true from the moral certainty we have thereof, [supposing that this moral certainty is not absolutely infallible] I mean, not a possibility of the contrary. And—that whereas this is doubt from deists Christianity, Religion true, as we do the ground stand [I own yes we have for its truth] and no further. For Example, such a proposition being delivered to me by such Tradition to be God's Word; and consequently, to be most infallibly true, for utterly impossible to be false. (For, so are all God's words); God obligeth me here to believe such a proposition to be his word, and so impossible to be false with no greater certainty, than his Veracity; which such a Tradition delivers it to me affords me of it: i.e. I am only most ready to believe the absolute infallibility of such a proposition, if all my evidence of its infallibility be only highly credible. — And p. 238. p. 277. That the certainty of our Faith is such [and consequently of a Divine Faith; for, though one of these is stronger in its evidence, source, and not so the other, yet they have both the same certainty, I mean, as to evidence, not as to adhesion; for no more extrinsic evidence, or light, or proof, hath a Divine Faith, than an Humane] doth not exceed the certitude of its principle; nor as the assent we yield to the Articles of our faith certainer than those motives [or that Tradition is] on which it is grounded. Which thing as Protestants contend for, so there seems no reason why it should be denied them. Thus R. H. And there also Layman is quoted, that—*Assensus cognoscitivus non potest excedere certitudinem principii quo nititur.* Ibid.*

Ibid. l. 5 from the bottom. *If Divine Faith, as to the Scriptures, can rest upon motives of credibility, there can be no necessity of the Church's Infallibility to a Divine Faith.* R. There can be no necessity of the Church's Infallibility to a Divine Faith, i. e. of this Article, of the Scriptures being Gods Word, when they are sufficiently evidenced to any to be so by Tradition. But first, if of some part of the Canon of Scripture there hath been found some variation in Tradition, here Church Infallibility, that is first sufficiently ascertained to us by Tradition, is necessary to the certainty of a Divine Faith concerning that part of Scripture. And, again, the same Church-Infallibility is necessary to so many other points of Faith, as are not clearly conveyed to the knowledge of all persons by Scripture, or the foresaid Tradition; as many Points are not.

Page. 298. l. 8. *Besides, this leaves every mans reason to be judge in the choice of his Religion; because every man must satisfy himself as to the credibility of those motives.* R. Granted, it doth so; till by such self-evident Tradition and motives he hath found the Infallibility of the divinely-assisted Catholic Church. After which found, I hope this Author will allow a submission of his judgment to her's in so many other things as she shall prescribe to him.

Id. l. 13. *The way of resolving faith by the Church's Infallibility doth unsettle the very foundations of Faith laid by Christ and his Apostles, who all supposed a rational certainty of the Motives of Faith to be a sufficient foundation for it; but the pretence of Infallibility doth overthrow the evidence of sense and Reason.* R. Overthrow the Evidence of sense and Reason? This must suppose first, that this pretended Infallible Church, (i. e. a lawful General Council,) doth in its Decrees go against all sense and Reason. But by whom can this Controversy, Whether they do so, be more justly decided, than by themselves? To no other side it will well

Id. l. 11. from the bottom. *And put the whole trial of the Truth of Christianity upon the pitiful proofs which they bring for the Church of Rome's Infallibility.* The Infallibility pretended is not of the Roman, but Catholic Church; alighted with the Roman indeed; and where of the Roman is a Principal Member, to of the Catholic, in a lawful General Council. The proof of it is the same pitiful one, that Protestants use for proving the Scriptures, *Viz.* the evidence of Tradition.

Page. 299. l. 10. *Either the Church's Infallibility is not to be believed with a Divine Faith, and certainly so, as Divine Faith without an Infallible Testimony; or this Divine Faith of the Church's*

Infallibility must be built on the Scripture, and so the Circle returns. R. Either the Church's Infallibility is not to be believed with a Divine Faith. Yes, it is. Or there may be a Divine Faith without an infallible testimony. If he means here by Testimony not the object, but the proof or ground of such Faith, I answer, Yes, there may; without any other infallible testimony, than that of Tradition. — *On this Divine Faith of the Church's Infallibility must be built on the Scripture.* No; but built on the forementioned Tradition. — And so the Circle vanissheth.

Obj. 1. 7. from the bott. In proving to adversaries the Church's Infallibility from Scripture they cannot avoid the Circle when the Question returns about the sense of those places; for then they must run to the Church. R. No; they will run to Tradition delivering such the sense of them. Or, when such a sense of Scripture is proved from the Infallibility of the Church, for proving this Church's Infallibility they will run forthright to Tradition, not back again to Scripture.

Obj. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. Church-infallibility being not by immediate Divine Revelation, but by a supernatural assistance promised in Scripture; it is impossible to prove this Infallibility but by first proving the truth of the Scripture. Secq. and so the Circle still returns. R. Church-Infallibility is not only a thing promised by our Lord in the Scriptures, but before they were written; and this Promise testified as well by Tradition, as by Scriptures; and so a proof of irreproducible not from one, but from either of these; and so the Circle vanissheth.

On his 5. 2.

p. 265.

Obj. 1. 6. from the bott. Who ingenuously confesseth the Question about the Resolution of Faith upon their Principles to be irreducible; so may one might easily guess by the intricacy and obscurity of his answer that his words are only these: — *To which intricate Question of Protestants I answer as distinctly as I can.* How doth this affectation of Wit catch at matter to despatch upon? *Ans. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.* Here the sense of R. H. his words contracted by the De is much mistaken; which Mistake furnisheth him with matter for the greater part of his Reply. A Divine Faith is said by R. H. always to resolve itself into, to rest or build its chief confidence upon, the Divine Revelation, not, humane Tradition; but not to its evidence: the evidence is hath for such Divine Revelation, whereon it rests, being only such Tradition. Also it is never said by R. H. that Divine Faith need any further evidence than the prudent Medives, or Traditions accompanied with them; or that such evidence which humane and corrupted or not inspired faith

hath. See the Sections the Dr. quotes in the Margent. See §. 148. (quoted by him in the next page) where it is said—*That these Motives serve antecedently for an introduction to, or (after it is introduced; for so it may be without them) for a confirmative of, Divine Faith; i.e. to [prove it or] make it credible to humane reason our own or others, that this faith is true, and not liable to error [and its object a truly Divine Revelation].*—And see the same said again, before, §. 135. where is added—*That no false Religion, no false faith can produce or lay claim to the like proof.*—And, though it is every where vindicated, That the Object of a Divine Faith is always and only Divine Revelation; yet the Proof produced for the verity of such a Divine Revelation, its Object, is only the Motives, or such a qualified Tradition.

Ibid. l. 10. R. H. his words.—*That there must be some particular ultimate Divine Revelation, &c. beyond which he can resolve Divine Faith no further.* The Context in R. H. is necessary here for knowing his sense. For, that Divine Faith always ends in some Divine Revelation, and proceeds no further, is constantly restrained; affirmed and spoken by R. H. only in respect of any further Divine Revelation not in respect of any proof at all; viz. not in respect of Tradition or the Motives yet further proving the truth of such ultimate Divine Revelation. For, this proof or evidence of the truth of such Revelation introductive to a Divine Faith is mentioned, you see, in the places cited before out of §. 148. and 135. and often elsewhere.

Ib. l. ult. R. H. his words.—*Or else I must rest there [in some Divine Revelation] with an immediate assent to it.* i.e. (As the words following expound it,) without having any other Divine Revelation, that proves the former. But it is not to be understood absolutely without having any other rational proof at all which may prove the former, and introduce such an assent to it; as is said before.

P. 303. l. 3. *The Grace of the Holy Ghost illuminating the understanding, that the prime Verity cannot ly in whatever thing it reveals.*

R. H. here added (*If perhaps the understanding herein needeth any light*) which clause the Dr. omits. For I finde this Omission affords him below || some exercise of his || p. 321, 322
witt, and matter to make circles on. But R. H. mentioneth such illumination, because who knows how far the Holy Ghost the Efficient cause in men of all Divine Faith may illuminate the understandings of the more simple people in those things which general Reason and discourse do sufficiently manifest to others? See below Note on p. 318. l. 10.

Job. 13. R. H. his words.—*As to the ground, Reason or Principle thereof, that equals in certainty the faith built upon it, I confess R. H. his Expression here to be not so clear as it might be. But his meaning is; that the Ground or Principles proving some Revelation, that is believed by this Divine Faith, to equal or to have the same certainty, as the other Divine Revelation, of which it is the motive ground or proof, hath, must be that first Divine Revelation from which in building his faith he proceeds to the other. For Divine Revelations are, by this Faith, believed to have (and so, if they be really Divine Revelations, they have) a far greater certainty than any other Testimony whatsoever that is not Divine, as being His word that cannot possibly ly or deceive: Neither is R. H. here so to be understood, as if a Divine Faith cannot be said to resolve it self further than the ultimate Divine Revelation, as to the rational introduce to believe it to be, or proof that it is, indeed, such a Divine Revelation. || but only, that it can resolve it self no further than this ultimate Divine Revelation, as into its Object proving another like object, and believed to equal in certainty or to be as certainly true or impossible to be false as it, i.e. that is believed to be the Word of God, as well as the other; which degree of certainty another rational Introduce or proof short of Divine Revelation Vix. any humane testimony (though having a Certitude sufficient) is not believed to have.*

|| See before
Notes on p.
302. l. 3. &
4. 10.

P. 304. l. 1. R. H. his words.—*Because the faith so filed is supposed to rest always on an higher ground [than the Prudential motives.] Vix. Revelation Divine.* By Ground here R. H. meaneth Object only, not Proof: i.e. should my faith believe any proposition, whatever it be, as a truth that is delivered to me by a sufficiently self-evident Tradition, but not as a Divine Revelation, or Gods own word, this Faith of mine would be no Divine Faith. Which Divine Revelation he calls Ground, both because it, and not any humane proof, is that on which a Divine Faith chiefly reposeth it self, and whereon it grounds its principal confidence; and because many times (though not alwaies) the belief of one Divine Revelation is grounded on another. But, if the Dr. understands it as implying that the ground or proof of any thing believed by this Faith to be a Divine Revelation, must be alwaies or only some other Divine Revelation, R. H. renounceth any such sense of it, and hath sufficiently declared the contrary. Not, but that, in the Resolution of a Divine Faith as is said, one Revelation or Divine Testimony may be the Ground or Reason of believing some other to be so; but because some Divine Revelation, on which a Divine Faith rests, cannot be founded on, or proved by, any other

ther Divine Revelation : but the rational proof and evidence of it must be Tradition.

Ib. l. 5. R. H. his words—Infallibility of the Church Grounded on Divine Revelation i. e. Either that delivered in Scripture, or that descending from our Lord's and his Apostle's times by Tradition.

Ib. l. 15. These are the Principles upon which this Guide &c. On his 9. 3. He must give me leave to remember him of one more omitted by him, perhaps because it made little to his purpose, in *R. H. 9. 135. viz. That there are morally certain, or infallible grounds, or motives, producible both for the Christian Religion, and Faith, in general; and for all the Articles thereof, as they are believed in the Catholick Church: which grounds, or any equal to them, no other Religion besides Christianity; nor, in Christianity, no other Self, or seducing private Spirit, out of the Catholick Church, can possibly plead, or pretend to.—Which ever remains a constant way of distinguishing to the world, and to all men's reason, a true Divine Faith wrought by God's Holy Spirit, from these counterfeit ones wrought by the evil Spirit. So that Catholicks for this Divine Faith [that rests only on Divine Revelation as its formal object] always have many extrinsecal motives and assurances to render this faith in reason credible and acceptable to themselves and others, which no false religion, no false faith can produce or lay claim to, and which, when the internal plerophory of this faith wrought by the Spirit is not publicly conspicuous or manifest abroad, are a standing rational evidence of the verity of Christianity against all other Sects of Religion, and against all Heretics. With which morally certain Grounds or Motives See *R. H.* also concluding all the particular Instances he makes of the Resolution of Faith, 9. 149. 150. 151. And here also the Holy Spirit, though the necessary Efficient of all Divine Faith, yet is clearly disclaimed by *R. H.* from being any proof or evidence of such a faith to our selves, or others. This Principle of *R. H.*, well considered by this Author, might have prevented his Reply; and, remembered by the Reader, will easily remove any mistaking glosses, which this Author is willing to put upon some of the other of *R. H.* his Propositions that are mentioned by him; and especially, of the 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. and 9th.*

Ib. l. 10. from the bottom. I have but two small things to object against this way. 1. That it gives up the cause in dispute. 2. That notwithstanding it doth not avoid the main difficulties. If giving up the cause in dispute to the Doctor yet avoids not the main difficulties, then these main difficulties, now are on the Doctor's side, and he to solve them. For, what would he have of *R. H.*? As for giving up his cause, (of which more by and by) *R. H.* is such

such a lover of Peace, and his own ease, as he wisheth he could always gratify his Adversary on this manner, so it might be without loss of any necessary Truth. And it is no wonder if Catholick Writers are frequently liable to such an Imagination (for, Accusation I cannot call it) in Protestants of giving up the Cause. For, if it be considered in most Controversies, how much it is, that Protestant Writers charge upon Catholicks (I know not whether on purpose to raise the greater odium amongst the people to their Religion, wherein they think they do God good service) I say charge upon them more than, or different from, what they hold, they may in some sense truly stile the Catholick Concessions, thwarting and retrenching such charge of theirs, to be almost perpetually a yielding up of the Catholick or the Roman cause; i.e., that they are pleased to say or feign to be the Roman.

Ib. l. 7. from bott. The cause in dispute [i.e. with T. C. answering Archbp Lawds Book] was. Whether the infallible testimony of the Church be the necessary foundation of Divine Faith?

Church-Infallibility as divinely assisted is one of the Articles of the Catholick Faith; and so, is believed as such, by a Divine Faith. If therefore T. C. affirm this Infallibility the necessary foundation of all Divine Faith, it must be so of that Divine Faith also that believes it self; i.e., It must be affirmed to be the foundation of it self: Whereas T. C. for the rational proof therof manifestly founds this Article on the Motives. And p. 62. to the Archbp. objecting, that Catholicks believe the Church infallible because she saith so, he returns this Answer—*If we be asked, How we know [i.e. concerning the ground or proof we have of it] the Church to be infallible; our last answer is not (as he feigns) because she professeth her self to be such, but we know her to be infallible by the Motives of Credibility, which sufficiently prove her to be such.* Thus he. And the Catholick Writers, Cardinal Lugo, and others, seem to argue in this point very clearly—*Probatnr facile* (saith he) *quia hoc ipsum [Ecclesiam habere auctoritatem infallibilem ex assistentiâ Spiritus Sancti] creditur fide divinâ, qua docet in Ecclesiâ esse hujusmodi auctoritatem, ergo ante ipsum fidei assensum non potest requiri cognitio hujus infallibilis auctoritatis.* However, could this Author shew any such thing in T. C. he must excuse R. H. if he doth not engage himself in this matter; who hath not the leisure to clear to the Reader and unravel all the Controversy first between the Arch-Bishop and A. C. and then between Dr. Stillingfleet and T. C. it is enough that R. H. is well back'd by very Claical Catholick Authors in what he hath said in this matter. But, if this proposition be thus limited and understood, That the infallible testimony of the Church is a necessary

sary foundation of the certainty of a Divine Faith in all other Articles of faith, to all such persons at least to whom these Articles are not sufficiently cleared by Tradition, [I insert this, because Catholics, granting Tradition accompanied with the other Motives a sufficient evidence and proof of Church-Infallibility, are not to be thought to deny it to be so for any other Articles that are in the like manner evidenced.] R. H. cannot be shewed to have said any thing contradictory to it; nay, hath also urged it. See, of those here cited by this Author, Prop. 10.

P. 305. l. 10. *But he saith, it is copiously proved by many learned Catholics.* And is it not so, as he saith? And then, if it be so; hath not the Dr. so much more cause to rejoice, that not R. H. but all these Catholick Doctors have given up the cause? And then, why are we not agreed? And how comes he, being so well satisfied with his victory, to urge some main difficulties against them still, and to continue the warr still with R. H. when on his own side?

P. 306. l. 9. from the bott. *Nay he cites Father Knot himself, &c.* But what will he say, if I cite also his great Antagonist Mr. I. S. as on R. H. his side too in this matter? || But, || *Error*
because it is done elsewhere, I here omit it. *Non-plust.*

P. 307. l. 12. *That Divine Faith must rest upon Divine Revelation.* Rest on it only, and always, as its Object; for *p. 133. 139.*
therefore is it called Divine; but not always as its proof, or *143. &c.*
ground; Or, as if a Divine Faith either must have for the Divine Revelation it believes another Divine Revelation which may prove it such, or else must acquiesce in it without any proof at all, that it is such. Things, this Author would impose on R. H.; and things which infer either some Divine Revelation to be a *per se notum*, or a process in infinitum.

Ib. l. 14. This Divine Revelation, upon which faith is built is that which is first made known to the person, and from which he proceeds to other matters of faith. The words, *Upon which Faith is built*, are an indefinite and ambiguous expression: for, as it is true, that the faith of some Divine Revelation may be built upon another, so false, that the faith of every Divine Revelation must be so, (which is that only that serves the Doctor's turn). And R. H. hath no such proposition or principle as this, That there must be some certain Divine Revelation, on which all the rest that are the objects of a Divine Faith must be built, or grounded: Or, that every Divine Revelation, that it may be believed by a Divine Faith must necessarily be confirmed, grounded on, or proved by

some other Divine Revelation: Or lastly, that a Divine Faith must rest in such a Divine Revelation as hath not another Divine Revelation to confirm it, with such an immediate assent as not to have any other proof or reason at all, why it assents to it. These imagined by this Author do render *R. H.* his notions confused and unintelligible. And, for this, I appeal to the 5th and 6th propositions cited before by the Doctor p. 302. and the Notes I have made on them p. 302. l. 3. and *Ib.* l. 10. — and l. ult. . It is said by *R. H.* p. 281. §. 148. *That Faith, quatenus Divine, rests always on a Divine Revelation; but that is, on it as its Object, in which it chiefly & ultimately confides and relies on; (as it is expressed also §. 126.*

That a Divine Faith relies on and adheres to the Revelations themselves as its object;) but not always rests on it, as its Evidence or Proof of that which is its Object. It is said by him p. 284. §.

153. *That there is an ultimate Divine Revelation whereon a Divine Faith resteth, and into which, and no humane Motives, it resolves itself.* But that is; as this Faith is Divine, a Divine Revelation or Gods word must also be that, on which it ultimately relies, or reposeth (or, if he will, buildeth) its confidence: an expression usual to Protestants as well as Catholics. See the Quotation, out of Bishop *White* and *Laud*, Note. 2. and the Doctor saying the same in the place cited out of him below in Note on p. 324. l. 4. It is often said: *That, in the Resolution of a Divine Faith, there must be some or other particular Divine Revelation beyond which a Divine Faith can proceed no further in its Resolution; but that beyond which is as to Divine Revelations.* And Instances are added to make this clear; which see in 3d Disc. §. 149. 150. 151.

So, for example, If one be asked, Why with a Divine Faith he believes Transubstantiation, or such a sense of *Hoc est Corpus meum*, and of other Texts concerning this subject, to be Divine Revelation or God's Word? & shall answer, he believes it from another Divine Revelation, the Infallibility of the Church divinely assisted giving such a sense of these Texts: And, again, upon this shall be asked, Why with a Divine Faith he believes such Infallibility of the Church? here, unless he can bring another Divine Revelation on which to ground it, his Divine Faith must finally rest; as to any further proceeding in Divine Revelations to prove this; but not so, as to all proof of it. For, so he may proceed in giving for a rational and sufficient certain proof of this Divine Revelation, Tradition qualified with the other Motives. Which Tradition is a proof indeed of, or rational inductive to, a Divine Faith; but no Object of it; for, this Divine Faith rests only as to its Object on Divine Revelation, or Testimony; and such

such Tradition is believed only with an humane Faith, to all which Resolution of Faith the Reader * may see R. H. is far from affirming some one certain Divine Revelation, upon which first made known to a person all the rest of his faith must necessarily be built: And * may see, that a Divine Faith, rationally, rests ultimately in any Divine Revelation which is sufficiently evidenced to it to be Divine by the foresaid Tradition; As, either in the Infallibility of Scripture; or, of the Church; or, the Divine Testimony of Miracles.

Ibid. l. 17. This Divine Revelation [he means on which all the rest of the faith is built,] is not one and the same to all; but to some the Authority of the Scriptures, to some the authority of the Church.

R. H. speaking of the order of one's learning the Articles of the Christian Faith, not of any fundamental Article, on which first learnt all the rest have a necessary dependence, faith; that one may learn, from his instructors in it, one Article before another promiscuously. As for example: first learn the infallible authority of the Scriptures, and out of them the infallible authority of the Church; or first the infallible authority of the Church, and from it the Canon of Scripture: and so for others, without putting any necessary or natural precedence amongst them. As if one could not be believed by a Divine Faith before the other. In which that he may not think R. H. singular, he may view the Testimonies cited by him 4. 128.

Ib. l. 10. from the bott. Divine Faith must rest upon this Revelation with an immediate Assent to it, without enquiring further. See Note on p. 302. l. ult.

Ib. l. 6. from the bott. That the Holy Ghost, &c. See Note on p. 303. l. 43.

P. 308. l. 11. *It cannot understand what that particular Divine Revelation is into which as into its prime extrinsecal motive Faith is here resolved.* Divine Faith is resolved into some ultimate Divine Revelation as its Object (Faith in the notion of Divine having no other object of it but Divine Revelation) though not always resolved into one and the same, but various, as any one learns them. But, is not ultimately resolved into some Divine Revelation as its prime extrinsecal motive or the first reason of its believing such and such to be Divine Revelations; the thing here enquired after by the Dr. but so as resolved into Tradition so and so qualified with other Motives. For which reason of believing see R. H. every where repairing to this Tradition in his Resolution of a Divine Faith, See 9. 149. where it is said — *I believe the Church Infallibility as divinely Assisted from the Motives of Credibility which do so persuade me.* See 9. 150.

which concludes thus—*If it be further asked, What rational ground I have to think this is a persuasion of God's, and not of some evil Spirit, or this indeed an Apostolical Tradition [or Divine Revelation] which I am told is so? Here I urge for these the prudential Motives. Again see §. 131. where the Resolution of Divine Faith ends in the Church's Revelation, as Church is taken for multitudine illustrum virorum &c. i.e. in Tradition so and so circumstantiated; yet the certainty or infallibility of which Relation I believe not with a Divine or infused, but with an humane, acquired, or rational faith; since Divine Faith in the common notion of it, is called only that which hath Gods Word or testimony for its object. See also §. 135. the words quoted before in Note on p. 304. l. 15. I think this is language plain and intelligible enough, unless to those who are so earnest to confute an Adversary, that their passion or haste will not suffer them to understand him; or will misrelate what they well understand, rather than be silent, which is too unworthy a thing to be charged on this Author. But here note, that as to some particular Divine Revelation the immediate reason or ground of believing it may be another Divine Revelation; but then the reason of the first Revelation will be Tradition &c. 2ly. That there is affirmed by R. H. no such Divine Revelation into which all other are necessarily resolved.*

1b. l. 12. from the bott. The ultimate Resolution of Divine Faith is to this [the reason of believing] I am told is that particular Divine Revelation which is first made known to a man. R. Not told so, but the contrary by R. H. shewed in the last Note.

P. 309. l. 4. On what ground do you believe this Revelation to have been from God with such a Divine Faith as must rest [i.e. for its object] upon Divine Revelation? R. On Tradition.

1b. l. 6. The ultimate Resolution of a Christians Divine Faith [R. H. means as to its object, not evidence] is into that particular Divine Revelation first made known to him.

1b. l. 12. When particular Divine Revelation is that on which I ground the Divine Faith of this Proposition, that the Doctrine of Scripture is Gods Revelation. It may be grounded on the Divine Revelation of Church's Infallibility, if this be to such a person as is not a man; but it is not necessary that it be grounded on any other precedent Divine Revelation at all. For, the Scriptures being Gods Revelation may be the object of a Divine Faith though it be grounded only on a rational evidence, Tradition. Nor doth a Divine Faith require any other Resolution of it than this Tradition, for the Reason of its believing such Divine Revelation.

1b. l. 17. R. viz. this Ground of a Divine Faith [cannot be

be understood of the rational evidence of the truth of the Divine Revelation: [Yes, it is.] For, what is asserted by him must be a sufficient Foundation for Divine Faith. [Nowhere is this asserted by R. H., but the contrary. See before Note on p. 304. l. 19. and on p. 398. l. 11.] which must rest upon nothing short of Divine Revelation [True, (and R. H. his Assertion), for its Object; but false, if understood for its Evidence.]

P. 310. l. 7. Cannot be any further resolved or proved by Divine Faith. Cannot, i.e. As to the producing any further Divine Revelation; for, so, must be a process in infinitum; observed by Layman.

It l. 14. From whence it follows, that this Divine Faith may be where there is neither infallible nor prudential motive in, as it may be, where no account at all can be given of it. Neither infallible, nor prudential motive, are not R. H. his words. The first of these, a morally infallible Motive, R. H. affirms not to be necessary always as the introductive of a Divine Faith; & hath given sufficient proof of it, §. 128. &c. The second, a prudential Motive, though not advancing to a moral infallibility, not to be necessary, he nowhere saith; For, he who receives the Christian Faith from his Parish Priest or his Parents, neither of them morally infallible, yet, these being the most credible persons he hath access to, hath a prudential Motive of his faith, though not such as amounts to a moral certainty, or that evidence that is afforded by a General Tradition. And such is the Divine Faith of Mixture, home-bred, and young, persons.

It l. 8. from the bott. The question put by him is, why he believes the things contained in the Gospel of S. Matthew to be divinely revealed? Why? i.e. upon what ultimate Reason or Ground R. H. believes them to be so. Now R. H. puts no such Question there; and, had he, the Answer must be; That the Reason, why he believes the matter, or, if you will any Text, contained in S. Matthew's Gospel to be Divine Revelation, is the Church's Testimony, as taken for illustris multitudo or sancta gens hominum prudentum, &c. or Tradition, so and so qualified. But R. H. being asked, what he resolves the Divine Faith of this matter into, and what it rests itself upon as its proper object, and that wherein it reposeth its greatest confidence, he answers, upon the Divine Revelation, and Veracity; Or, that this is Gods Word, (and so cannot possibly be false or fail him), which the Church or Tradition, hath told him is so; and though the Church or Tradition telling him so is all his evidence, yet that Divine Revelation, which he is told to be so, is his chiefest confidence; and upon it, not the testimony of

Tradition, is his main reliance. It comes to the same pass, if any one say, he believes the matter in *S. Matthew's* Gospel to be divinely revealed, because that Church-infallibility assisted by the Holy Ghost tells him so; the infallible assistance of which is a Divine Revelation. For here a Divine Faith rests on the Divine Revelation of the Church's infallibility as the object on which it chiefly relies: but, if *R. H.* be asked, What rational ground, proof, evidence, or introduction he hath to believe such Church-infallibility, as he relies only to be a Divine Revelation; he answers *Tradition*; or the testimony of the Church in another acception, *Viz.* that mentioned but now. The sum is. For the truth and not failing him of the matter delivered in *S. Matthew's* Gospel a Divine Faith in its adherence and supreme value of such Truths relies principally on the Veracity of God who is said to reveal these things; not, on the veracity of the Relaters, or any humane authority, who tell him that God hath revealed them; though he hath no other rational proof of this, that God hath revealed such things, save the veracity only of these Relaters. If *Dr. S.* cannot understand this, I hope the Reader will. For, it is the ordinary language of Protestants; as well as Catholics, in their explication of a Divine Faith. See before Note 3.

P. 312. l. 4. *Dr. S.* *rests* from the bott. That this Faith must rest upon Divine Revelation. *i. e.* If this Faith be Divine, it must have, for its object on which it relies, Divine Revelation. So the Divine Revelation of the matter contained in *S. Matthew's* Gospel is the proper object on which a Divine Faith relies and rests itself; but such a Divine Faith needs not to be built upon any other Divine Revelation that shall evidence this Divine Revelation to it, that it is such. But the forementioned Tradition is of this a sufficient assurance to it. This matter then of *S. Matthew's* Gospel he believes to be Divine Revelation from the Church's testimony or Tradition. Again, believes it impossible to be false and so most firmly adheres to it, and relies on it, from its being Divine Revelation, and its being delivered by God himself for truth. What great profundities are here on the one side, or perilous Dilemmas on the other? *Dr. S.* *rests* from the bott. His faith is not resolved into the Church's Authority, but Divine Revelation concerning the Church. *i. e.* The formal object of a Divine Faith here, and whereon its confidence is placed, is not the humane authority of the Church as taken only for the testimony of a world of wise and holy men &c. or the authority of Tradition, but is the Divine Revelation of the Church's Infallibility assisted by the Holy Ghost.

In which notion this Church-Infallibility is one of the Articles and Objects of a Divine Faith. See Note on p. 310. l. (8.). If I have missed something here that the Doctor thinks to his purpose, I hope I may be excused from answering him where I cannot understand him.

P. 314. l. 7. *Why may not one particular way serve all mankind for it?* &c. It is clear by most of this Author's Discourse, that he hath very much misunderstood R. H. his sense; whether this be from the infelicity of R. H. his expressions, or the Doctor's not using more advertency, & less averfeness, in his reading them, others can more equally judge. In repeating so often the same things for rectifying these his mistakes, I fear I have too much trespassed already on any ordinary Reader's ingenuity. To what follows here to his 6th Section, I need say only this, or rather, need not say it, it having been said so oft already: That, whether a Divine Faith of some particular point, believed as revealed by God, doth resolve it self into the Divine Revelation of the Scriptures, that declare it, their being Gods Word, which is one Article of our Faith; or resolves it self into the Divine Revelation of the Church, that teacheth it, its being infallible; I mean, as assisted by the Holy Ghost, which is another; (as either of these ways, certainly, one may resolve it): And then one being further questioned for the reason, ground, or evidence of his believing either such Divine Authority of Scripture, or such Infallibility of the Church, to be a Divine Revelation, doth alledge Tradition as circumstantiated with the other Motives to be this, or (which is the same) the Church's Testimony considered only as *illustris multis & virorum prudentum* [But note, that not any such ground or evidence, but only Divine Revelation and Gods Veracity is the formal object of this Divine Faith wheron it rests]; I say, whether soever of these be done, here are no vicious Circles, no absurdities at all incurred, supposing all the world should resolve their faith only in the first; or only in the latter, way.

P. 315. l. 7. *We will put the case that any one person doth resolve his Faith concerning God's Revelation into the Church's Infallibility.*

He must mean here, God's Revelation concerning some other particular Article of his Faith; else he knows Church-Infallibility is reckoned by Catholicks one of God's Revelations.

Ib. l. 13. P. Laymanns words, Because the Church's infallibility is one of the things to be believed as revealed by God, and therefore cannot be the ground of Faith to any.

One Divine Revelation may well be the ground of believing another; as the infallible Scriptures their saying; so, may be the ground of my believing that

that our *Lord* died. But no Divine Revelation can be the ground of believing all Divine Revelations; the thing *Layman* speaks of: For, then it must be the Ground of believing it self. Nor no Divine Revelation can be the ultimate ground or reason of believing all other Divine Revelations to be such, unless it were a *per se notum*.

On his §.6.

P. 316. l. 1. *I am far from understanding this way of immediate assent to the Divine Revelation.*

It should seem so, by his discourse here concerning it. The yielding an *immediate* assent to some or other Divine Revelation in the Resolution of Faith is not meant by *R. H.* absolutely, as excluding all other evidence reason or proof that can be given of such Divine Revelation, as this Author mis-represents it; or, such, as is given to self-evident Principles. But *immediate* assent, as excluding all further proof or evidence from any other Divine Revelation. As it is explained and limited expressly by the words following it in *R. H.* more than once. See §. 145. (which is quoted by this Authour, in his p. 302. for *R. H.* his 6th. Principle), where, after these words—*Or else I must rest there with an immediate assent so it* (which words the Dr quotes) *it follows—and acknowledge that I have no Divine Faith that God hath said it that relies on any other Divine Revelation,* which words the Dr hath conveniently omitted, for his making this descant upon it. See also, immediately before, in *R. H.* §. 144. where it is said—*There must be some particular ultimate Divine Revelation assigned by every Christian, beyond which he can resolve Divine Faith no further; [it follows] and full proving or confirming which Revelation, he can produce no other Divine Revelation; [but] there must end, unless a process be made in infinitum.* A thing clear enough.

P. 317. l. 15. *That is not the thing we enquire for; but a sufficient foundation for Divine Faith.*

And Such a sufficient foundation by *R. H.* is Tradition affirmed to be, the assuring a Divine Faith that the Revelation; it fully rests on: as to its object, is Divine.

Ib. l. 17. R. H. asserts, that our faith doth immediately rest upon [some] Divine Revelation, without proceeding to another Revelation for the ground of it. This is asserted, and this is true, unless we proceed in Revelations in *infinitum*; but not, without proceeding to some other rational proof of the Revelation it rests on, as it is a Divine Faith. Notwithstanding which rational proof, a Divine Faith grounds it self still on the Divine Revelation only, as the object wherein it reposeth its chief confidence, without having a like appreciation or adherence to, the proof, though it hath no further

further evidence of the Revelation, save what the proof affords. Again, It grounds it self often (but cannot so always, or for all,) on one Divine Revelation as the proof of or reason of believing, another: but never is said to ground it self on any as the proof of it self, or as the same Divine Revelation being its own ground. Nor is it any where said by R. H. that one Divine Revelation must necessarily be the ultimate ground; or motive, or reason, of believing another.

1b. l. 5. from the bott. We will suppose the Church's Infallibility to be the matter believed; I demand a reason why this is to be believed? The Answer is. Because God hath revealed it in his Word. [The Answer may be, but must not necessarily be this, if he means, Word written.] There the Question returns, what reason have you to believe that to be the word of God. Here the Guide cries out, stand there. [Stand there; for giving a Reason of this from any other Divine Revelation (And will not, must not, this Authour say the same?) But not; for giving a reason thereof still, and that a sufficient one; but which Reason is no Divine Revelation, nor consequently object, but yet the evidence, of a Divine Faith, viz. Tradition.] But say I, you tel me I must believe this to be Gods Word with a Divine Faith, and this Divine Faith must rest upon a Divine Revelation as its formal cause. [I do not remember R. H. hath any where used such a term. But I suppose, he means; that R. H. hath told him, that a Divine Faith must always rest upon a Divine Revelation as the proof, reason, or evidence; that any other Revelation, which it believes, is Divine (which mistake runs through a great part of the Drs Reply, and so indeed makes it a Reply to his own fancies, not to R. H. his assertions). But R. H. never told him any such thing, but in his several instances of Resolutions of Faith tells him the contrary. Of which enough hath been said already.] Assign me shew. What Divine Revelation is there for this Divine Faith to rest upon? [A Divine Faith indeed must always rest on some Divine Revelation or other for its object; this Catholics and Protestants are agreed upon with R. H. So a Divine Faith here, in the Dr's instance, finally rests upon this Divine Revelation; that the Holy Scriptures are Gods Word; and upon this placeth its confidence, not on the rational evidence, it hath thereof. But, for the evidence that these Scriptures are so, it rests upon Tradition.] Then it is certain by your Principles—Divine Faith doth not alwayes need a Divine Revelation. [True: not for its evidence or the reason why it is believed such; but a Divine Faith must always have a Divine Revelation for its Object. Are not these great difficulties? And is not the worthy, the admirable, Guide hard put to it?] P. 318.

On his §. 7.

P. 310. l. 10. from the bott. *It may be all this may be cleared by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, &c.* Now another fiction or chimaera comes upon the Stage. All that R. H. hath said concerning the Holy Ghost in the Resolution of a Divine Faith, is these two things. 1st. *That it is the Efficient thereof, by illuminating the Understanding to discern, and swaying the Will to assent to, all whatever is necessary thereto, and in which there is any need (as to working this Faith) of its illuminating the one, or inclining the other; things, which I think, all Christianity faith with him; and I think, the Doctor faith here, in the words following. [Not that I do the least doubt the efficacy of the Divine Spirit, &c.]* And for which see R. H. his 7th and 8th Principle, as they are recited by the Dr. in his p. 303. 2^{ly}. (For which see in R. H. p. 135.) *That, though only the Holy Ghost worke in Christians a Divine Faith as to the supernatural, powerful and vivificall efficacy thereof, yet the internal plenitude of this Faith, wrought by the Spirit, is not conspicuous or manifestive abroad; but that there are many other extrinsecal Motives and assurances that render this Divine Faith in reason credible not only to others, but to our selves also; viz: the Motives or Tradition qualified with them; such as no false Religion, no false Faith, can produce.* From whence also it follows; that the Resolution of any particular mans faith into the Spirit, as its Efficient, can also be only hypothetical, i. e. that, supposing my Faith is Divine, it is effected by It.

Here then, by these it appears, that though R. H. often mentioned this Energy of the Holy Spirit, as to giving an account of that firm adherence this Divine Faith hath to the Divine Revelations, which far exceeds its evidence, or also that of any Demonstration or Science; yet he hath clearly removed it, or its illuminations, or persuasions, from being alledged as any reason or ground, or evidence of this Faith, either to any others, or also to our own selves. And so, when a Question is asked, Why, i. e. upon what ground, Reason, or Evidence, I believe such or such to be a Divine Revelation, the internal operations of the Holy Spirit cannot be urged either to others, to whom we cannot manifest any such inward operation; or for assuring our selves, whose operations we cannot perfectly discern within us; unless such person have some extraordinary Revelation thereof, such as to that person carries a self-evidence and conviction with it.

Therefore those Questions, which the Dr. asks R. H. in the three or four pages next following, such as these; || *Whether our faith, as to the Motive and reason of it, can, or ought to be resolved into the Illumination of the Holy Ghost?* † *Whether our assurance*

|| p. 319.

† Ibid.

rance [i. e. the proof or evidence that assures us] of God's veracity and the truth of his revelations do flow from the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God? || Why, [or for what reason] R. H. believes such particular Articles to be God's Revelations? repeated by him p. 322. The Answer to them cannot be that which this Author puts, as he useth where he pleases, in an Italic letter for R. H's, viz. Because the Holy Ghost illuminates the mind in such things; which Illuminating, R. H. willingly confesseth, he can neither prove at all to others, or to himself, that it doth so, as to his particular faith, or the Object thereof, but only in general, that it doth so in all Faith that is Divine: [and so here another Question is answered] — How R. H. is sure, that such are Illuminations of the Holy Ghost? who denies any assurance thereof? But R. H. his Answer is, that such a Divine Faith as to the reason, ground or evidence securing to it the Divine Truth of its Object, is resolved into Tradition; not the Holy Spirit. And so to his other Questions † † p. 321. — How R. H. can possibly give himself any good account of his faith in this manner? And || — Is not this to tell unbelievers that we can give them no satisfaction as to the grounds of our Divine Faith? The Answer is, that R. H. gives no such account for satisfaction to himself, or to unbelievers. || p. 320.

Lastly, for those other Questions he asks R. H. † How he is † p. 322. sure with a Divine Faith that there is a Holy Ghost? || How assured of || p. 321. the truth of what the Holy Ghost enlightens him in? or, How sure, that whatsoever God saith, is true? To these I answer; That the Holy Spirit may illuminate the mind in any of these matters: For, in what thing, that is possibly intelligible, can R. H. or also Dr. Seillingfleet, exclude its Illuminations, if there be any need thereof? Or, in what common natural Principle, as to some persons, may there not be used? when the Law or light of Nature may be so defaced and darkened, as that there be some who deny a God: And, when that, which is known by Reason to one, nothing hinders, but that it may be so by the illumination of Gods Spirit to another. So, Faith Acquisite hinders not but that there may be a Faith Infused of the same thing: and knowledge, Wisdom, Eloquence, Boldness, Discretion, are said to be Gifts of the Holy Spirit 1. Cor. 12. 8. &c. which are the gifts of Nature, or the fruits of Industry, to others: neither can we justly so limit it, that this Spirit instructs none in any knowledge, which may be possibly attained by some other means. But notwithstanding this, such Illuminations are not affirmed by R. H. to be any proof of such propositions, of which Proof the Question is made: But, for such proofs, some of them, as God's Being and Veracity either need none,

none, being self-evident by the light of Nature, or are easily confirmed by right Reason, and the rest are revealed in those Scriptures, which Tradition hath sufficiently evidenced to us to be Gods Word; and may, hence, be proved; and so also may the two other be believed, because here revealed; viz. God believed to be, and his Word to be true, because It saith so; if the Infallibility of these Scriptures, in what they say, be first granted. And there want not good reasons given by S. Thomas 22. q. 2. art. 4. why things, that may naturally be known, should be so, by the Holy Spirit, revealed; and upon it with a Divine Faith believed; 1. *Ut ceteris Dei notitiam homines assequerentur*; where the light of nature in any is darker than that of Revelation. 2. *Ut cognitio Dei sit communior*; as to the simple and unconsiderative. 3. *Ut certius*; i.e. as to adhesion of Faith to that which is believed to be divinely revealed; which adherence is greater, than that to Science. And thus I think R. H. may reasonably be discharged of this Author's 7th Section.

P. 319. l. 10. R.H. saith, *that the Holy Ghost doth illuminate the understanding that the prime verity cannot ly in whatever thing it reveals.* [R. H. added, (if perhaps the understanding herein needeth any lights) which words had not the Dr. omitted both here and in his p. 303. his arguings about the non-necessity of such Illumination might have been spared] and also illuminates it, *that the particular Articles of our faith are its Revelations, i.e. the revelations of the Prime Verity.* And R. H. there, saith further: *That the same Holy Spirit persuades and operates in the will such a firm adherence unto these Articles, as manytimes far exceeds that of any humane Science or demonstrations.*—And doth any Catholick or Protestant, or Dr St. deny, either that the Holy Spirit may illuminate the Intellect, or sway and incline the Will in any of these? or, that it doth not so in the work of a Divine Faith, accordingly as the person hath a necessity thereof? What meaneth then such an Exclamation again? *it—Was ever any thing more fully said to this purpose by the highest Calvinists or Enthusiasts?*—And—*Have the very Guides in Controversies found no way to escape one whirlpools but by falling into another?* What Circles I pray, what whirlpools are here? What word that is not truth? That the grace of a Divine and salvificall Faith is always wrought in us by the Holy Spirit is said by all. A Divine Faith then of what? Surely of this, that that which we believe is Gods own Word, and that He, which is Truth it self, cannot ly, &c. Now is this the same, as saying, I know or am assured I have a Divine Faith, by the Testimony of the Holy Spirit within me that I have so? Can we have no such effects of the Holy Spirit within

within us, unless certainly known also to be the effects of the Spirit? Or, can we give any satisfactory account to others of such internal effects of it, if indeed our selves did most certainly know them? The Holy Spirit indeed cannot work in us a Divine Faith of a Divine Revelation but that It at the same time testifies or internally tells us, that the Revelation we believe is Divine; this is certain. But it may work in us a Faith Divine &c. tell us it is so; and not testify also, that itself, and not a false Spirit, is It, that worketh, or perswades, or telleth us this. We know, that nothing but the Holy Spirit can work in us a Divine Faith of a Divine Testimony: but know not therefore, that ~~our~~ faith or its object is such; Or, if we do know this concerning the object, this is affirmed to be had from some other evidence, not the Spirit's; and also, after we are certain enough, that the Revelation we believe is Divine, yet we cannot hence collect necessarily the belief thereof to be such as proceeds from the Holy Spirit; since the Devil, Judas, Hereticks, may also believe such Divine Revelations as such; but with a *disensue, acquire*, not such a *divinely-infused* faith as is the gift of the Holy Spirit, perswading and piously affecting the Will, as well as enlightening the intellect.

P. 323. l. 7. *That the Infallibility, &c.* R. H. his *On his* §. 8. words §. 153. and as cited before by the Dr p. 304; are these. *That the Infallibility of the Church grounded on Divine Revelation* [whether written and conveyed to us in the Scriptures, or unwritten and conveyed by Tradition,] *is a main ground and pillar of a Catholick's faith for any other Articles thereof, that are established by the same Church's definitions, where the Scriptures or Tradition Apostolick are to him doubtful.* In these words, I say, is no vicious Circle (with which the Dr. chargeth them) but a very clear Truth. For, upon this Article of Faith *the Church's Infallibility* once granted to a Catholick and supposed, such Catholick, most justly, makes this Article his ground of believing any other Article of his Faith whatever, which this *infallible Church* declares for such: Unless any will say he cannot, justly, believe one in that, wherein he is revealed by God to be infallible.

P. 324. l. 4. R. H. his words. §. 151. *Which Apostolical Tradition, related or conveyed to me by the Church,* [i.e. by Church-Tradition, as Church is taken in the latter sense, for *illustris multitudo hominum prudentum*, &c. as R. H. in this very section explains himself] *I believe with a Divine Faith by the internal operation of the Holy Spirit, without having at all any further Divine Revelation from which I should believe this Revelation to be Divine. Nodum in scirpo.* It is said here; that a Divine Faith, in this Resolution,

ultimately acquiescent, *i.e.* as in the proper object of it, in *Apostolical Tradition*, without having any further Divine Revelation on which to ground it. Who can deny this? Not the Dr. as I shall shew you by and by. It is said, that the Divine Faith or belief of this Apostolical Tradition is wrought in us by the Operation of the Holy Spirit: Or that the Holy Spirit is the Efficient thereof. Nor can the Dr. deny this. And, whereas he saith, that the Holy Spirit is the efficient of the Faith of the other Divine Revelations, as well as of this last, this is willingly granted him; only the reason of *R. H.* his mentioning it here with application to this ultimate Divine Revelation was to shew, from whence it was that a Divine Faith hath so firm an adherence to that Revelation of which it hath no other further Divine Revelation for its Ground. This for the *Efficient*.

Next, for the Evidence or Proof of this Ultimate Divine Revelation, namely that it is such; it is said expressly here to be believed such from the *Relation and Conveyance of it to us by the Church*; *i.e.* saith *R. H.* in the same Section—*the Church's Tradition or Testimony, Church being taken here in the latter sense mentioned before §. 126.* But, as *R. H.* there goes on, This Divine Revelation & not the Church's Relation, is the Object of our Faith, *quatenus* Divine; & that wherein it finally builds or rests itself. See his following words in the same, §. 151.

Now, that the Dr. saith the very same thing concerning a Divine Faith its finally resting on a Divine Testimony, See in him p. 355. (in answer to *E. W.*) writing there of the *Notion of Divine Faith*—*A Divine Testimony* (saith he) *being implied, that assent, which I give to any thing as true upon the account thereof, may be called Divine Faith*—And—*If that humane testimony at last leads me to that which is divine, then the faith must receive its denomination from that [Divine Testimony] which it rests upon.* And p. 356. *The same faith in several respects may be called both humane and divine. Humane as it is first grounded upon the testimony of men, and Divine, as it finally rests upon the Testimony of God.* Where, however he can make good, that an Humane and Divine Faith are the same, when as before p. 347. he saith—*That he questions not the truth or necessity of Divine Grace in the production of a Divine Faith*—*That the Grace of Faith doth not come merely from ourselves, but is the gift of God*—*whereby an inward certainty may be produced, and so firm an adherence to the Truth believed, which all the arguments and torments in the world could never shake: and p. 356. affirms Judas to have the one but not the other, yet he here asserts*—*That a Divine Faith finally rests upon the Testimony of God; viz. that what he saith is true, and that such is his Revelation.* He then

then being asked the Question; What a Divine Faith resolves it self into as that which it finally rests upon? must necessarily, according to what he saith here, answer, Into the *Divine Testimony*, as to such or such a Revelation: and then, asked again, As to what Divine Revelation? must name some ultimate one, whereon such faith finally rests. For, as he also saith here || *To resolve the belief of one Divine Testimony into another is to proceed without end.* || p. 357. And here then is all that said by Dr. Sr. which is opposed by him, when said by R. H.: and, as to the Resolution of a Divine Faith for that it ultimately rests in, Dr. Sr. also must stop here in Divine Revelation, or all is lost. And, whereas he adds † after ward — *That the faith that such a thing is a Divine Revelation cannot be entertained at first on the account of a Divine Testimony* [&c. as I understand him, cannot at first be proved by or collected from it] as he saith it, so R. H. willingly grants it. † p. 358.

Only, speaking here of the Notion of a Divine Faith, such a Faith, in the ordinary Notion of Catholicks, is not only the believing of something divinely revealed upon the Divine Testimony impossible to deceive; but is, for the manner of it, such a belief of this by the Understanding as also piously affects, persuades and subdues the Will to love and adhere to it. Of which thus Bellarmine || *Hominem credere Articulos nostrae fidei ut oportet, ad hoc ut sit actus fidei Catholicae & incipit justificationis, includit tres conditiones. Una, ut certo credatur, ex parte objecti, id est, tanquam a Deo revelatum, & quod nullo modo falsum esse possit. Altera, ut firmiter credatur ex parte subjecti, id est, ut homo non dubitet, & malis potius mori, quam articulum fidei non credere. Tertia, ut ex pio affectu credatur, id est, quadam inclinatione pia erga Deum, qua incipit homo cervicem Deo flattere.* || *De Gratia & lib. Arbi. l. 6. c. 3.* And thus Layman † *Divine fidei assensus maximam & infallibilem adhesionis certitudinem requirit, &c.* † Theol. Moral. l. 2. Traet. 1. c. 3. — And — *Licet Fides sit virtus intellectus, tamen necessario requirit piam affectionem voluntatis movens intellectum ad assensum obsecutus fidei propositionibus.* And — *Major illa imò maxima quae in fide est certitudo adhesionis non provenit ex speculatione objecti, sed ex determinatione liberi arbitrii, Spiritus Sancti gratia adiuti.*

Ib. l. 16. *This is the ultimate progress of Divine Faith with him.*

And so with the Doctor too, as hath been shewed. All Divine Faith necessarily resting finally on some Divine Testimony and Revelation; though having some rational evidence antecedent that such Revelation is Divine.

What follows here is a pursuit of his own mistakes, that R. H. resolves Faith finally into the Testimony of the Holy Spirit.

P. 325. l. 17. *It is a great favour that the Holy Spirit is allowed to bring up the rear, &c. But by no means to go before Infalibi-*

lity

Eccles. 2. 2. *liry or Tradition.**Risum reputavi errem;* & *Gaudio dixi:*

Quid frustra deciperis? In this drollery and sporting at the Guide, *That is seeme*, by his Office of the Guide, he hath the opening of the Gate; which when his friends, *Infalibility and Tradition* are let in, he so rudely lets fall, as to cripple the rest. That this it is to be a Guide in, *Contrary* to direct *Infalibility, Tradition, and the Holy Ghost*, to know their distance and keep their due places. And what these are capable of doing better service, than the Holy Ghost is: ever like to do him, the greatest use of it being to make good a *pass*. That, if he may be so bold, as once more to presume to ask this wonderful Guide, &c.

[where I hope I need not seriously acquaint the Dr. that R. H. styles the Church Governours assembled in a General Council, not himself, or his Book, (called in the Title page, *An Account concerning the Ecclesiastical Guide*.) this Guide; which he also affirms infallible in determining all Necessaries, and assisted herein by the Holy Ghost promised to them by our Lord: This surely the Dr. knows well enough, and only borrows the mis-application, he can tell best for what ends.] But I say, in such derision & sporting, this Author may do well, first to remember sometimes S. Pauls Admonition: *Neque stultiloquium, neque Scurrilias* [and I may add what he mentions before, *neque maledicentia*] *que non conveniunt*; especially to Divines in handling and writing of Divine Matters: And, next, may do well, in such transports of his Fancy, which had been lost but for the happiness of a mistake, to minde better what he saith. For, is not *Tradition* (to speak in his language) one of his friends, as well as R. H. his; on whom he saith R. H. *lets his gate fall so rudely as it cripples them?* and doth not Dr. S. by it prove the Divinity of the Scriptures? And see also before in him p. 301. the 34 Proposition quoted by him out of the Guide: where it is said, that a Divine Faith, which is always caused by the operation of the Holy Spirit, may be had without the Believers having any Certainty as yet of the Church's Infalibility, or also of Tradition and the Motives, (i. e. in his language, without their passing through the Gate) yet never had without some rational Introduction; whereinto also, as its Evidence, and not into the Holy Spirit that operates it, he resolves his faith.

P. 326. l. 12. Remember you believe this with Divine Faith and this Divine Faith must have Divine Revelation. Must have Divine Revelation? Speak out. For what? For its Object, and that it chiefly confides in and depends upon? So, it hath; *Apostolical Tradition*. Or, for a proof, reason, ground therof? No. Thus it needs not have it. This R. H. every where renounceth, as inserting a process in infinitum: a consequence, any child may discern.

lk. l. 5. from the bott, And yet his Principle is, that Divine Reve-

Eph. 5. 4.

-4. 31.

Revelation is necessary to Divine Faith. [Speak out again: Is necessary what, for its Proof? No. For its Object? Yes. This R. H. would willingly gratify our Author with; but this will not serve his turn for Matter to make Circles on.] But there can be none [no Divine Revelation] here (saith he) by his own confession. Yes by R. H. his own confession there is, viz. Apostolical Tradition, the last object of this Divine Faith on which it relies; and which is further rationally proved to it by the Tradition of posterity and the Motives.

P. 327 l. 2. Well; But how comes this Apostolical Tradition to be known to him? By the Church he saith. Not by the Church; as this infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost, and as it is an Article of Faith; but by Church-Tradition, as R. H. saith in these following words in the very same Section, [the Church's Tradition of Testimony, the Church being taken here in the latter sense mentioned before §. 126. Thus R. H. and so these two acceptions of the Church are mentioned by the Dr. §. 301. among the Principles of R. H.] But these words the Dr. hath omitted, lest they might have marred his Circle. Now, this successive Tradition qualified with the other Motives is affirmed by R. H. to carry a sufficiently certain self-evidence in it that such is Apostolical Tradition descending from them to latter ages, affirmed, there needs no further or other Resolution of Apostolical Tradition (as here made the ultimate Divine Revelation relied on by a Divine Faith) as to a rational evidence thereof, that it is truly such.

§. 17. But do you believe her infallible with Divine Faith? Yes, he saith that must be done. Yes, What? Church-Tradition believed by R. H. infallible with a Divine Faith? R. H. saith just the contrary in the very same Section when he speaks of this Traditive Relation of the Church as taken in the latter sense. His words there are these: With a Divine Faith I do believe the Apostolical Tradition related by the Church; but I do believe the Church her truly or infallibly (I mean, not as infallibly here relates to the Divine Promise, but to the prudential Motives) relating this Apostolical Tradition with an acquired or rational faith. And here I must believe the Dr. to have been very supine and drowsy at least, to imagine that in writing this his Confessioe did not trouble him.

§. 18. Was there not such a perplexed Giddens Counterspoies? Here are brought by Dr. S. two contradictions concerning delivering the Church's Relation of Apostolical Tradition: the one, That such Relation is to be believed infallible with a Divine Faith: the other, No; but with an Humane and acquired Faith; Both put in an Italick letter as the Answers of R. H. The one said indeed by R. H. the other merely imposed by Dr. S.; there

there being no such word in *R. H.* or any thing that can imply it; and, after this, he cries out, *Was there ever such a perplexed Guide?* Nay, *Was there ever such a dilingenuous wresting of anothers writings?* as may be seen not only here in this passage, but almost through his whole Reply: which I think these my *Remarks* have partly showed. He confounding things most exactly distinguished, so to make Mazes and Circles, or to patch up again his broken ones, for the periwading of such Readers, as he may be confident, will never peruse or examine his Adversary's Discourse?

Ib. l. 17. The Infallibility of the Church is sometimes to be believed with a Divine Faith, and sometimes not. The Church's Infallibility as assisted with the Holy Ghost and acknowledged a Divine Revelation is one thing, the Church's Tradition another. Why will not you remember here *R. H.*'s first proposition recited in your p. 301. clearly distinguishing these?

Ib. l. 18. And yet when it [the Church's Relation or Tradition] is not to be believed with a Divine Faith, it is the foundation of the Divine Faith of Apostolical Tradition. Yes. If he means by Foundation the rational proof or evidence, that such is Apostolical Tradition, Doth not he himself acknowledge it so for the Scriptures being Gods Word?

P. 328. l. 3. The thing I now enquire after is, Whether any other Infallibility can secure such a faith besides the Infallibility by promise? Yes. The Infallibility of Tradition sufficiently secures it.

Ib. l. 15. And I do believe the Church's Infallibility by Apostolical Tradition, and Apostolical Tradition by the Church's Infallibility. No. He believes Apostolical Tradition by the common Tradition of sixteen times qualified with the *Majores*. And so the Dr's fancied Circle easily vanishesth.

Ib. l. 1. from the bot. See now what an admirable Guide in Controversies we have met with [and with what sk. and dexterity he hath escaped the Circle.] By this Note I think it doth appear that *R. H.*'s Refutation of Faith stands clear and justifiable, especially from incurring any Circle; and that this Author's unhappy mistakes (too willingly admitted by him) are the only thing that could have furnished him with a seeming Answer, and put me to the trouble of these Animadversions. In which, for my often iterating the same Replies to the same Objections, not knowing the Capacity of my Readers, I desire with *S. Austin*, doing the like, — *Ut ignoscant scilicet m. l. 2. c. 1. scientes; ne offenderentur Nescentes.* And for any thing here wherein I may seem too contracted or obscure, that they would review the 1st Chapter of the 2d Disc. preceeding on this subject which is in this 2d Edition, somewhat enlarged, and in some things that have been liable to mistake, more explicated and cleared.

